arXiv:hep-ph/9503413v1 22 Mar 1995

SUNY-NTG-94-57

A Master Formula for Chiral Symmetry Breaking

Hidenaga Yamagishi
4 Chome 11-16-502
Shimomeguro, Meguro, Tokyo 153, Japan

and

Ismail Zahed
Department of Physics
SUNY, Stony Brook, New York 11794-3800, USA

Abstract

We derive a master formula for chiral $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ breaking, based on the Veltman-Bell equations and the Peierls-Dyson relation. Our approach does not rely on the use of the soft pion limit or an expansion around the chiral limit, and yields exact results for on-shell pions. Threshold theorems for $\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$, $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi N$, $\pi N \rightarrow \pi\pi N$, $\gamma N \rightarrow \gamma\pi N$, $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi\pi N$ and $\pi N \rightarrow \pi\gamma N$ are recovered, and corrections to them are given. The reactions $\pi \rightarrow e\nu\gamma$, $\pi \rightarrow e\nu e^+e^-$, $\gamma\pi \rightarrow \gamma\pi$ and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$ are also discussed. A general formula for $\pi\pi$ scattering and a new one loop effective action are obtained. The new effective action reproduces the KSFR relation, and yields specific estimates for the pion polarisabilities. A detailed comparison with baryon-free chiral perturbation theory to one loop is made. An extension of our effective action to two loops is outlined.

SUNY-NTG-94-57
March 1995

1. Introduction

At low energies, chiral symmetry offers a powerful method for dealing with hadronic processes involving pions. Beginning with the original work of Nambu and coworkers [1], various approaches have been formulated to assess the consequences of chiral symmetry and its breaking, such as the infinite momentum limit [2], effective Lagrangians [3, 4, 5], chiral perturbation theory [6, 7, 8], and gauge-covariant divergence equations [9].

In the infinite momentum limit of Fubini and Furlan, the role of the pion as a Nambu-Goldstone boson is not emphasized. Instead, the multiplet aspect of an approximate symmetry is used. The approach relies on the algebraic structure of chiral symmetry through the use of sum rules.

The effective Lagrangian formulation introduced by Weinberg [5] stems from soft pion theorems, and emphasizes the character of the pion as a Goldstone boson. The idea is that since only chiral symmetry is relevant, then any choice of an effective Lagrangian for the pion as a Golstone mode that accounts for this symmetry and its soft breaking, as well as the general precepts of unitarity and causality, should yield the same low energy predictions. In principle, by calculating and renormalizing all loop diagrams using infinitely many counterterms one has the most general result compatible with the underlying symmetries. In practice, this task can only be carried out using chiral perturbation theory.

In chiral perturbation theory, amplitudes are systematically expanded in the square of the pion momenta. To leading order, chiral symmetry and covariance uniquely specify the character of the effective Lagrangian. To maintain unitarity, loop diagrams have to be included. The latter generate a growing set of divergences at higher momentum that require the introduction of new counterterms. As such, the effective Lagrangian is nonrenormalizable. Nevertheless, to any order in chiral perturbation theory, the counterterms are usually finite in number, and their coefficients may be extracted from the data. The power of this construction is that it yields relationships between various processes at threshold. In a series of papers, Gasser and Leutwyler have systematically used this scheme to one loop [8]. Their result is an empirically determined effective Lagrangian to fourth order in the pion momentum. Their work has rekindled interest in the subject and triggered a flurry of papers in this direction [10].

In the approach pioneered by Veltman and Bell [9], the gauge covariant divergence equations as opposed to an effective Lagrangian, are taken as fundamental. In retrospect, this approach appears to be relatively unknown and thus unexploited. The purpose of this paper is to develop the method to the point where it gives results comparable to other methods. In the process, we also derive new results in the form of general formula for $\pi\pi$ scattering, $\pi \rightarrow e\nu\gamma$ decay, $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$ fusion, πN reactions, γN reactions, and finally a new one-loop effective action. Through chiral reduction formulas our approach allows an exact rewriting of scattering amplitudes in terms of correlation functions and form factors, some of which are directly measurable. The results embody chiral symmetry and unitarity to all orders in the pion momentum, and as such provide important insight beyond the loop expansion or specific models.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In section 2, we spell out our conventions. In section 3, we derive master formulas based on the Veltman-Bell equations [9] and the Peierls-Dyson formula [11] in the case where the pion is massless. In section 4, these formulas are extended to the massive case. In sections 5-17, the chiral reduction scheme is applied to $\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $\pi \rightarrow e\nu\gamma$, $\gamma\pi \rightarrow \gamma\pi$, $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$, $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi N$, $\pi N \rightarrow \pi\pi N$, $\gamma N \rightarrow \gamma\pi N$, $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi\pi N$ and $\pi N \rightarrow \pi\gamma N$ processes. Our treatment of the electromagnetic interaction is only of first order in the electric charge. In section 18 the new one-loop effective action is derived, and shown to reproduce the KSFR relation. This effective action is used to estimate $\pi \rightarrow e\nu\gamma$, $\pi \rightarrow e\nu e^+e^-$, $\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $\gamma\pi \rightarrow \gamma\pi$ and the pion polarisabilities. In section 19, comparison is made with other approaches, and some open issues are discussed. In Appendix A, we give some other applications of the Peierls-Dyson formula and related equations. In Appendix B, we introduce some definitions in relation to the Dirac constraint problem. In Appendix C, we discuss the Gell-Mann algebra in our context. In Appendix D, we establish some consistency checks and reformulate the master formula. In Appendix E, we give a general analysis of one-loop effects. In Appendix F, we summarise some useful one-loop integrals. In Appendix G, we discuss some unsolved technical issues in chiral perturbation theory as formulated by Gasser and Leutwyler [8]. In Appendix H, we outline the calculational framework for a two-loop calculation.

2. Conventions

Throughout, isospin indices will be often suppressed using matrix notation and

$$A \cdot B = A^a B^a \qquad\qquad \underline{A}^{ac} = \epsilon^{abc} A^b \qquad\qquad \mathbf{1}^{ab} = \delta^{ab}. \tag{1}$$

Green's functions are all normalized to $1/(k^2 - m^2)$ in momentum space, so that

$$(-\Box - m^2)\Delta_R(x) = (-\Box - m^2)\Delta_A(x) = (-\Box - m^2)\Delta_F(x) = \delta^4(x). \tag{2}$$

The retarded and advanced Green's functions satisfy

$$\Delta_R(x-y) = \Delta_A(y-x) = 0 \qquad\qquad (x \preceq y), \tag{3}$$

where $x \preceq y$ means that x is in the past light-cone of y or spacelike with respect to y. The Jordan-Pauli distribution $\Delta = \Delta_R - \Delta_A$ is related to free (incoming) pion fields through

$$\Big[\pi^a_{\rm in}(x), \pi^b_{\rm in}(y)\Big] = i\delta^{ab}\Delta(x-y) = \delta^{ab}\frac{1}{(2\pi)^3}\int \frac{d^3k}{2k^0}\Big(e^{-ik\cdot(x-y)} - e^{+ik\cdot(x-y)}\Big), \tag{4}$$

where the pion energy is on-shell $k^0 = \sqrt{\vec{k}^2 + m_\pi^2}$. The propagator is given by

$$\Big\langle 0\,{\rm in}|T\Big(\pi^a_{\rm in}(x)\pi^b_{\rm in}(y)\Big)|0\,{\rm in}\Big\rangle = i\delta^{ab}\Delta_F(x-y). \tag{5}$$

The corresponding distributions for the massless case are denoted as usual with D. Creation and annihilation operators are defined as

$$\pi^a_{\rm in}(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3}\int \frac{d^3k}{2k^0}\Big(a^a_{\rm in}(k)e^{-ik\cdot x} + a^{a\dagger}_{\rm in}(k)e^{+ik\cdot x}\Big) \tag{6}$$

so that one-pion states are covariantly normalized.

3. The Master Formula : Massless Case

3.1. Veltman-Bell Equations

Our starting point is an action $\mathbf{I}$, invariant under local $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ gauged with external c-number vector and axial vector fields v^a_μ and a^a_μ. Examples are massless QCD with two flavors

$$\mathbf{I} = -\frac{1}{2g^2}\int d^4x {\rm Tr}_C\Big(G_{\mu\nu}G^{\mu\nu}\Big) + \int d^4x \overline{q}\gamma^\mu\Big(i\partial_\mu + G_\mu + v^a_\mu\frac{\tau^a}{2} + a^a_\mu\frac{\tau^a}{2}\gamma_5\Big)q, \tag{7}$$

where the gluon field strength is given by

$$G_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu G_\nu - \partial_\nu G_\mu - i[G_\mu, G_\nu]$$

and the gauged nonlinear sigma model

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{I} = \frac{f_\pi^2}{4}\int d^4x \mathrm{Tr}\Big[\quad & \Big(i\partial_\mu U + v_\mu^a\Big[\frac{\tau^a}{2}, U\Big] + a_\mu^a\Big[\frac{\tau^a}{2}, U\Big]_+\Big) \\ & \Big(-i\partial^\mu U^\dagger - v^{\mu b}\Big[\frac{\tau^b}{2}, U^\dagger\Big] + a^{\mu b}\Big[\frac{\tau^b}{2}, U^\dagger\Big]_+\Big) \quad \Big],\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where U is a chiral field. We will assume that the external fields v_μ^a and a_μ^a are smooth and fall off rapidly at infinity, so that various operations such as partial integration and functional differentiation are allowed.

By Noether's theorem, the currents $\mathbf{V}$ and $\mathbf{A}$ as defined through

$$\mathbf{V}^{\mu a}(x) = \frac{\delta \mathbf{I}}{\delta v_\mu^a(x)} \qquad\qquad \mathbf{A}^{\mu a}(x) = \frac{\delta \mathbf{I}}{\delta a_\mu^a(x)}$$

obey the Veltman-Bell equations [9]

$$\nabla^\mu \mathbf{V}_\mu + \underline{a}^\mu \mathbf{A}_\mu = 0 \tag{9}$$

$$\nabla^\mu \mathbf{A}_\mu + \underline{a}^\mu \mathbf{V}_\mu = 0, \tag{10}$$

where $\nabla_\mu = \partial_\mu \mathbf{1} + \underline{\mathbf{v}}_\mu$ is the vector covariant derivative. In writing (9) and (10) we have used the fact that the Bardeen anomaly and the Wess-Zumino term vanish for $SU(2) \times SU(2)$. Actually, we should also consider the possibility of global anomalies associated with the fact that $\Pi_4(SU(2)) = \mathbf{Z}_2$ [12]. However, this issue will be ignored in this paper, and only gauge transformations connected to the identity will be considered.

Introducing the S-matrix $\mathcal{S}$ for fixed incoming fields and using the Schwinger action principle yield

$$<\beta\,\mathrm{in}|\delta\mathcal{S}|\alpha\,\mathrm{in}> = i <\beta\,\mathrm{in}|\mathcal{S}\int d^4x\Big(\mathbf{V}^{\mu a}\delta v_\mu^a + \mathbf{A}^{\mu a}\delta a_\mu^a\Big)|\alpha\,\mathrm{in}> . \tag{11}$$

The completeness of asymptotic states leads to the Peierls-Dyson formula [11] [1]

$$\mathbf{V}^{\mu a}(x) = -i\mathcal{S}^\dagger \frac{\delta \mathcal{S}}{\delta v_\mu^a(x)} \tag{12}$$

---

[1] See the footnote on p. 147 in particular.

$$\mathbf{A}^{\mu a}(x) = -i\mathcal{S}^\dagger \frac{\delta \mathcal{S}}{\delta a^a_\mu(x)}. \tag{13}$$

The Veltman-Bell equations (9-10) are then equivalent to

$$\mathbf{X}^a_V(x)\mathcal{S} = 0 \tag{14}$$

$$\mathbf{X}^a_A(x)\mathcal{S} = 0, \tag{15}$$

where we have introduced

$$\mathbf{X}^a_V(x) = \nabla^{ac}_\mu \frac{\delta}{\delta v^c_\mu(x)} + \underline{a}^{ac}_\mu(x)\frac{\delta}{\delta a^c_\mu(x)} \tag{16}$$

$$\mathbf{X}^a_A(x) = \nabla^{ac}_\mu \frac{\delta}{\delta a^c_\mu(x)} + \underline{a}^{ac}_\mu(x)\frac{\delta}{\delta v^c_\mu(x)}. \tag{17}$$

Some further related issues to the Peierls-Dyson formula are discussed in Appendix A.

3.2. Algebraization

The relations (14-15) simply express the invariance of the S-matrix under gauge transformations connected with the identity, since (16-17) are the generators of the local $SU(2)\times SU(2)$ symmetry:

$$\Big[\mathbf{X}^a_V(x), \mathbf{X}^b_V(y)\Big] = \Big[\mathbf{X}^a_A(x), \mathbf{X}^b_A(y)\Big] = -\epsilon^{abc}\mathbf{X}^c_V(y)\delta^4(x-y). \tag{18}$$

$$\Big[\mathbf{X}^a_V(x), \mathbf{X}^b_A(y)\Big] = \Big[\mathbf{X}^a_A(x), \mathbf{X}^b_V(y)\Big] = -\epsilon^{abc}\mathbf{X}^c_A(y)\delta^4(x-y). \tag{19}$$

We will assume that $\mathcal{S}$ obeys the Bogoliubov causality condition [13]

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta v^b_\nu(y)}\Big(\frac{\delta \mathcal{S}}{\delta v^a_\mu(x)}\mathcal{S}^\dagger\Big) = \frac{\delta}{\delta a^b_\nu(y)}\Big(\frac{\delta \mathcal{S}}{\delta v^a_\mu(x)}\mathcal{S}^\dagger\Big) = 0 \qquad (x \succeq y) \tag{20}$$

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta v^b_\nu(y)}\Big(\frac{\delta \mathcal{S}}{\delta a^a_\mu(x)}\mathcal{S}^\dagger\Big) = \frac{\delta}{\delta a^b_\nu(y)}\Big(\frac{\delta \mathcal{S}}{\delta a^a_\mu(x)}\mathcal{S}^\dagger\Big) = 0 \qquad (x \succeq y), \tag{21}$$

which can be rewritten more conveniently in the following form:

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta v^b_\nu(y)}\mathbf{V}^a_\mu(x) = \frac{\delta}{\delta a^b_\nu(y)}\mathbf{V}^a_\mu(x) = 0 \qquad (y \succeq x) \tag{22}$$

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta v^b_\nu(y)}\mathbf{A}^a_\mu(x) = \frac{\delta}{\delta a^b_\nu(y)}\mathbf{A}^a_\mu(x) = 0 \qquad (y \succeq x). \tag{23}$$

In other words, for fixed incoming fields, the current at x depends on the external fields only in the past light-cone of x. The Maurer-Cartan equations

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta v^b_\nu(y)}\mathbf{V}^{\mu a}(x) - \frac{\delta}{\delta v^a_\mu(x)}\mathbf{V}^{\nu b}(y) = i\Big[\mathbf{V}^{\mu a}(x), \mathbf{V}^{\nu b}(y)\Big] \tag{24}$$

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta a^b_\nu(y)}\mathbf{V}^{\mu a}(x) - \frac{\delta}{\delta v^a_\mu(x)}\mathbf{A}^{\nu b}(y) = i\Big[\mathbf{V}^{\mu a}(x), \mathbf{A}^{\nu b}(y)\Big] \tag{25}$$

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta a^b_\nu(y)}\mathbf{A}^{\mu a}(x) - \frac{\delta}{\delta a^a_\mu(x)}\mathbf{A}^{\nu b}(y) = i\Big[\mathbf{A}^{\mu a}(x), \mathbf{A}^{\nu b}(y)\Big] \tag{26}$$

then imply that the currents are local

$$\Big[\mathbf{V}^{\mu a}(x), \mathbf{V}^{\nu b}(y)\Big] = \Big[\mathbf{V}^{\mu a}(x), \mathbf{A}^{\nu b}(y)\Big] = \Big[\mathbf{A}^{\mu a}(x), \mathbf{A}^{\nu b}(y)\Big] = 0 \qquad (x \sim y). \tag{27}$$

3.3. Ward-Identities

The relations (12-13) and (22-26) allow us to define time-ordered and retarded products by

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{T}^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^{\mu a}(x_1)...\mathbf{V}^{\nu b}(x_m)\mathbf{A}^{\rho c}(x_{m+1})...\mathbf{A}^{\sigma d}(x_n)\Big) = \\ &(-i)^n \mathcal{S}^\dagger \frac{\delta}{\delta v^a_\mu(x_1)}...\frac{\delta}{\delta v^b_\nu(x_m)}\frac{\delta}{\delta a^c_\rho(x_{m+1})}...\frac{\delta}{\delta a^d_\sigma(x_n)}\mathcal{S} \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{R}^*\Big[\mathbf{V}^{\alpha e}(x), \mathbf{V}^{\mu a}(x_1)...\mathbf{V}^{\nu b}(x_m)\mathbf{A}^{\rho c}(x_{m+1})...\mathbf{A}^{\sigma d}(x_n)\Big] = \\ &(-i)^n \frac{\delta}{\delta v^a_\mu(x_1)}...\frac{\delta}{\delta v^b_\nu(x_m)}\frac{\delta}{\delta a^c_\rho(x_{m+1})}...\frac{\delta}{\delta a^d_\sigma(x_n)}\mathbf{V}^{\alpha e}(x) \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{R}^*\Big[\mathbf{A}^{\alpha e}(x), \mathbf{V}^{\mu a}(x_1)...\mathbf{V}^{\nu b}(x_m)\mathbf{A}^{\rho c}(x_{m+1})...\mathbf{A}^{\sigma d}(x_n)\Big] = \\ &(-i)^n \frac{\delta}{\delta v^a_\mu(x_1)}...\frac{\delta}{\delta v^b_\nu(x_m)}\frac{\delta}{\delta a^c_\rho(x_{m+1})}...\frac{\delta}{\delta a^d_\sigma(x_n)}\mathbf{A}^{\alpha e}(x). \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Differentiating (9,10,14,15) then yields the Ward identities for (28-30), *e.g.*

$$\nabla^{ac}_\mu(x)\mathrm{T}^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^{\mu c}(x)\mathbf{V}^{\nu b}(y)\Big) + \underline{a}^{ac}_\mu(x)\mathrm{T}^*\Big(\mathbf{A}^{\mu c}(x)\mathbf{V}^{\nu b}(y)\Big) =$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla^{ac}_{\mu}(x)\mathrm{R}^*\Big[\mathbf{V}^{\mu c}(x),\mathbf{V}^{\nu b}(y)\Big]+\underline{a}^{ac}_{\mu}(x)\mathrm{R}^*\Big[\mathbf{A}^{\mu c}(x),\mathbf{V}^{\nu b}(y)\Big]=\\
&\nabla^{ac}_{\mu}(x)\mathrm{T}^*\Big(\mathbf{A}^{\mu c}(x)\mathbf{A}^{\nu b}(y)\Big)+\underline{a}^{ac}_{\mu}(x)\mathrm{T}^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^{\mu c}(x)\mathbf{A}^{\nu b}(y)\Big)=\\
&\nabla^{ac}_{\mu}(x)\mathrm{R}^*\Big[\mathbf{A}^{\mu c}(x),\mathbf{A}^{\nu b}(y)\Big]+\underline{a}^{ac}_{\mu}(x)\mathrm{R}^*\Big[\mathbf{V}^{\mu c}(x),\mathbf{A}^{\nu b}(y)\Big]=\\
&i\epsilon^{abc}\delta^4(x-y)\mathbf{V}^{\nu c}(y)
\end{aligned}\tag{31}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla^{ac}_{\mu}(x)\mathrm{T}^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^{\mu c}(x)\mathbf{A}^{\nu b}(y)\Big)+\underline{a}^{ac}_{\mu}(x)\mathrm{T}^*\Big(\mathbf{A}^{\mu c}(x)\mathbf{A}^{\nu b}(y)\Big)=\\
&\nabla^{ac}_{\mu}(x)\mathrm{R}^*\Big[\mathbf{V}^{\mu c}(x),\mathbf{A}^{\nu b}(y)\Big]+\underline{a}^{ac}_{\mu}(x)\mathrm{R}^*\Big[\mathbf{A}^{\mu c}(x),\mathbf{A}^{\nu b}(y)\Big]=\\
&\nabla^{ac}_{\mu}(x)\mathrm{T}^*\Big(\mathbf{A}^{\mu c}(x)\mathbf{V}^{\nu b}(y)\Big)+\underline{a}^{ac}_{\mu}(x)\mathrm{T}^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^{\mu c}(x)\mathbf{V}^{\nu b}(y)\Big)=\\
&\nabla^{ac}_{\mu}(x)\mathrm{R}^*\Big[\mathbf{A}^{\mu c}(x),\mathbf{V}^{\nu b}(y)\Big]+\underline{a}^{ac}_{\mu}(x)\mathrm{R}^*\Big[\mathbf{V}^{\mu c}(x),\mathbf{V}^{\nu b}(y)\Big]=\\
&i\epsilon^{abc}\delta^4(x-y)\mathbf{A}^{\nu c}(y).
\end{aligned}\tag{32}$$

3.4. Asymptotic Condition

So far the discussion has been independent of whether chiral symmetry is manifest or spontaneously broken. The spontaneous breaking of chiral symmetry can be expressed in terms of the asymptotic conditions

$$\mathbf{A}^a_{\mu}(x)\to -f_{\pi}\partial_{\mu}\pi^a_{\mathrm{in,out}}(x) \qquad\qquad x^0\to\mp\infty, \tag{33}$$

where π_{in} and π_{out} are free incoming and outgoing massless pions, and f_{π} is the pion decay constant. In writing (33) we have also assumed the absence of stable axial vector mesons or other stable pseudoscalars. Analysis of the gauged nonlinear sigma model and experience with ordinary scalar field theories [14] indicates that the condition (33) can be conveniently incorporated into the present analysis if we impose the constraint

$$f_{\pi}\nabla^{\mu}a_{\mu}-J=0 \tag{34}$$

Here J is some new function. Some useful concepts regarding the use of (34) as a Dirac constraint may be found in Appendix B.

With the above in mind, let us introduce a modified action,

$$\hat{\mathbf{I}}=\mathbf{I}-\frac{f_{\pi}^2}{2}\int d^4x\; a_{\mu}(x)\cdot a^{\mu}(x)-\int d^4x\Big(f_{\pi}\nabla^{\mu}a_{\mu}-J\Big)(x)\cdot\pi(x), \tag{35}$$

where π is some suitable pion field. The new S-matrix $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ is related to the old S-matrix $\mathcal{S}$ subject to (34) as

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}} \approx \mathcal{S}\mathrm{exp}\Big(-i\frac{f_\pi^2}{2}\int d^4x a_\mu(x)\cdot a^\mu(x)\Big). \tag{36}$$

In general, the new currents

$$\mathbf{j}_V^{\mu a}(x) = \frac{\delta\hat{\mathbf{I}}}{\delta v_\mu^a(x)} \qquad\qquad \mathbf{j}_A^{\mu a}(x) = \frac{\delta\hat{\mathbf{I}}}{\delta a_\mu^a(x)}$$

have no simple relation with the old currents, $\mathbf{V}_\mu^a$ and $\mathbf{A}_\mu^a$, since the quark or pion fields in $\mathbf{I}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{I}}$ obey different equations of motion. However, they can be weakly related as

$$\mathbf{j}_{V\mu}^a(x) = \mathbf{V}_\mu^a(x) - f_\pi \underline{a}_\mu^{ac}(x)\pi^c(x) \tag{37}$$

$$\mathbf{j}_{A\mu}^a(x) \approx \mathbf{A}_\mu^a(x) - f_\pi^2 a_\mu^a(x) + f_\pi(\nabla_\mu\pi)^a(x). \tag{38}$$

We also observe that the pion field π follows from $\hat{\mathbf{I}}$ through

$$\pi^a(x) = \frac{\delta\hat{\mathbf{I}}}{\delta J^a(x)}. \tag{39}$$

Since (37-38) remain invariant under the analog of (354),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{j}_V^{\mu a}(x) \quad &\to \mathbf{j}_V^{\mu a}(x) + f_\pi(\underline{a}^\mu\Lambda)^a(x)\\
\mathbf{j}_A^{\mu a}(x) \quad &\to \mathbf{j}_A^{\mu a}(x) - f_\pi(\nabla^\mu\Lambda)^a(x)\\
\pi^a(x) \quad &\to \pi^a(x) - \Lambda^a(x),
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

we may assume without loss of generality that the asymptotic one-pion components (33) are contained entirely in the field π and not in the new axial current $\mathbf{j}_A$ or Λ. As a result, the transformations (40) may be regarded as the analog of the Nishijima-Gursey transformations [15] or reparametrizations of the chiral field U in the nonlinear sigma model.

3.5. Master Formula

Upon substitution of (37-38) into the Veltman-Bell equations (9-10), we obtain the weak relations

$$\nabla^\mu\mathbf{j}_{V\mu} + \underline{a}^\mu\mathbf{j}_{A\mu} + \underline{J}\pi \approx 0 \tag{41}$$

$$\Big(-\nabla^\mu\nabla_\mu + \underline{a}^\mu\underline{a}_\mu\Big)\pi \approx -J - \frac{1}{f_\pi}\Big(\nabla^\mu\mathbf{j}_{A\mu} + \underline{a}^\mu\mathbf{j}_{V\mu}\Big) \tag{42}$$

The first equation is simply the weak version of the vector conservation law for $\hat{\mathbf{I}}$, namely

$$\nabla^\mu\mathbf{j}_{V\mu} + \underline{a}^\mu\mathbf{j}_{A\mu} + \underline{J}\pi = 0. \tag{43}$$

To solve the second equation, we will introduce the retarded and advanced Green's functions

$$\Big(-\nabla^\mu\nabla_\mu + \underline{a}^\mu\underline{a}_\mu\Big)\,G_{R,A}(x,y) = \delta^4(x-y)\ \mathbf{1} \tag{44}$$

and

$$\mathbf{K} = \nabla^\mu\nabla_\mu - \underline{a}^\mu\underline{a}_\mu - \Box = 2\underline{v}^\mu\partial_\mu + (\partial^\mu\underline{v}_\mu) + \underline{v}^\mu\underline{v}_\mu - \underline{a}^\mu\underline{a}_\mu. \tag{45}$$

The combination (44-45) obeys a standard identity

$$G_{R,A} = D_{R,A} + D_{R,A}\mathbf{K}G_{R,A} = D_{R,A} + G_{R,A}\mathbf{K}D_{R,A} \tag{46}$$

where we have introduced a condensed notation with space-time integration absorbed into matrix multiplication. Also,

$$G_R^{ab}(x,y) = G_A^{ba}(y,x) \tag{47}$$

since the operator $-\nabla^\mu\nabla_\mu + \underline{a}^\mu\underline{a}_\mu$ is self-adjoint, being associated with the quadratic action

$$\mathbf{I}_Q^0 = \frac{1}{2}\int d^4x\Big((\nabla^\mu\pi)\cdot(\nabla_\mu\pi) - (\underline{a}^\mu\pi)\cdot(\underline{a}_\mu\pi)\Big). \tag{48}$$

Solving (42) under the asymptotic conditions (33) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\pi \approx\quad & \Big(1+G_R\mathbf{K}\Big)\pi_{\rm in} - G_RJ - \frac{1}{f_\pi}G_R\Big(\nabla^\mu\mathbf{j}_{A\mu} + \underline{a}^\mu\mathbf{j}_{V\mu}\Big)\\ \approx\quad & \Big(1+G_A\mathbf{K}\Big)\pi_{\rm out} - G_AJ - \frac{1}{f_\pi}G_A\Big(\nabla^\mu\mathbf{j}_{A\mu} + \underline{a}^\mu\mathbf{j}_{V\mu}\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

Using the Peierls-Dyson formula

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{j}_V^{\mu a}(x) &= -i\hat{\mathcal{S}}^\dagger\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta v_\mu^a(x)}\\ \mathbf{j}_A^{\mu a}(x) &= -i\hat{\mathcal{S}}^\dagger\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a_\mu^a(x)}\\ \pi^a(x) &= -i\hat{\mathcal{S}}^\dagger\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta J^a(x)}\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

and the Yang-Feldman relation $\pi_{\rm out} = \hat{\mathcal{S}}^\dagger \pi_{\rm in} \hat{\mathcal{S}}$, we may rewrite (49) into the following form

$$\Big(\frac{\delta}{\delta J} + \frac{1}{f_\pi} G_R \mathbf{X}_A\Big)\hat{\mathcal{S}} \approx -iG_R J\hat{\mathcal{S}} + i\hat{\mathcal{S}}\Big(1 + G_R\mathbf{K}\Big)\pi_{\rm in} \tag{51}$$

$$\Big(\frac{\delta}{\delta J} + \frac{1}{f_\pi} G_A \mathbf{X}_A\Big)\hat{\mathcal{S}} \approx -iG_A J\hat{\mathcal{S}} + i\Big(1 + G_A\mathbf{K}\Big)\pi_{\rm in}\hat{\mathcal{S}}. \tag{52}$$

From (43) we also have

$$\mathbf{T}_V\,\hat{\mathcal{S}} \equiv \Big(\mathbf{X}_V + \underline{J}\frac{\delta}{\delta J}\Big)\hat{\mathcal{S}} = 0. \tag{53}$$

Equations (51-53) constitute the *master formulas* in the chiral limit, replacing (14-15). The differential operators on the left-hand side of (51-52) may be checked to be tangent vectors, so the system is meaningful as a weak relation.

Some insight into these equations may be obtained by expanding the gauged nonlinear sigma model action (8)

$$\mathbf{I} = \frac{f_\pi^2}{2}\int d^4x\, a^\mu(x)\cdot a_\mu(x) + f_\pi \int d^4x (\nabla^\mu a_\mu)(x)\cdot \pi(x) + \mathbf{I}_Q^0 + \mathcal{O}\Big(\frac{\pi^3}{f_\pi}\Big) \tag{54}$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{I}} = \int d^4x J(x)\cdot\pi(x) + \mathbf{I}_Q^0 + \mathcal{O}\Big(\frac{\pi^3}{f_\pi}\Big), \tag{55}$$

where $\mathbf{I}_Q^0$ is the quadratic action (48). We note that the above expansion up to and including quadratic terms is invariant under redefinitions of the pion field, $\pi \to \pi' = \pi + \mathcal{O}(\pi^3)$, which are independent of the external fields and conserve G-parity. It is worth noting that the system (51-53) is linear in the extended S-matrix $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$. This is in contrast with the unitarity and causality conditions which are quadratic in $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$. As shown in Appendix D, this allows us to associate characteristic curves with the system. The equations (51-53) may be used to derive various results in the chiral limit. However, we will proceed to the more realistic case with massive pions.

4. The Master Formula : Massive Case

4.1. Asymptotic Condition

As before, we will assume the asymptotic conditions

$$\mathbf{A}_\mu^a(x) \to -f_\pi \partial_\mu \pi^a_{\rm in,out}(x) \qquad\qquad x^0 \to \mp\infty, \tag{56}$$

which also imply that

$$\partial^\mu \mathbf{A}^a_\mu(x) \to +f_\pi m_\pi^2 \pi^a_{\rm in,out}(x) \qquad\qquad x^0 \to \mp\infty. \tag{57}$$

For definiteness, we will take the symmetry breaking term to be a scalar-isoscalar that transforms as the $(2,2)$ representation of $SU(2)\times SU(2)$. Specifically, for QCD we will take

$$-\hat{m}\int d^4x\overline{q}q \tag{58}$$

while for the nonlinear sigma model we will take

$$+\frac{f_\pi^2 m_\pi^2}{4}\int d^4x{\rm Tr}\Big(U+U^\dagger\Big). \tag{59}$$

We may further couple external scalar and pseudoscalar sources s and p^a, through

$$-\frac{\hat{m}}{m_\pi^2}\int d^4x\overline{q}\Big(m_\pi^2+s-i\gamma_5\tau^a p^a\Big)q \tag{60}$$

$$+\frac{f_\pi^2}{4}\int d^4x{\rm Tr}\Big((m_\pi^2+s-i\tau^a p^a)U+U^\dagger(m_\pi^2+s+i\tau^a p^a)\Big) \tag{61}$$

and assume that the sources are again smooth and fall off rapidly enough at infinity.

4.2. Master Formula

From here on, the action $\mathbf{I}$ will be understood as the sum of (7) and (60) for QCD, and (8) and (61) for the nonlinear sigma model. The associated currents and S-matrix will be denoted by $\mathbf{V}^a_\mu$, $\mathbf{A}^a_\mu$, and $\mathcal{S}$ as before. We will define the scalar and pseudoscalar densities as

$$\sigma(x)=\frac{1}{f_\pi}\frac{\delta\mathbf{I}}{\delta s(x)}=-\frac{i}{f_\pi}\mathcal{S}^\dagger\frac{\delta\mathcal{S}}{\delta s(x)} \tag{62}$$

$$\pi^a(x)=\frac{1}{f_\pi}\frac{\delta\mathbf{I}}{\delta p^a(x)}=-\frac{i}{f_\pi}\mathcal{S}^\dagger\frac{\delta\mathcal{S}}{\delta p^a(x)}. \tag{63}$$

Explicitly, these densities for QCD are

$$\sigma=-\frac{\hat{m}}{f_\pi m_\pi^2}\overline{q}q \qquad\qquad \pi^a=+\frac{\hat{m}}{f_\pi m_\pi^2}\overline{q}i\gamma_5\tau^a q \tag{64}$$

and for the nonlinear sigma model are

$$\sigma = +\frac{f_\pi}{4}\mathrm{Tr}\Big(U + U^\dagger\Big) \qquad\qquad \pi^a = -i\frac{f_\pi}{4}\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\tau^a(U - U^\dagger)\Big). \tag{65}$$

The Veltman-Bell equations (9-10) then read

$$\nabla^\mu \mathbf{V}_\mu + \underline{a}^\mu \mathbf{A}_\mu + f_\pi \underline{p}\pi = 0 \tag{66}$$

$$\nabla^\mu \mathbf{A}_\mu + \underline{a}^\mu \mathbf{V}_\mu = f_\pi(m_\pi^2 + s)\pi - f_\pi p\sigma, \tag{67}$$

where we have used the fact that no anomaly is generated by adding the densities (64) to the QCD action. For the nonlinear sigma model, we may take (66-67) as part of the definition of the theory. By the Peierls-Dyson formula (12-13, 62-63), the Veltman-Bell equations (66-67) are equivalent to

$$\Big(\mathbf{X}_V + \underline{p}\frac{\delta}{\delta p}\Big)\mathcal{S} = 0 \tag{68}$$

$$\Big(\mathbf{X}_A - (m_\pi^2 + s)\frac{\delta}{\delta p} + p\frac{\delta}{\delta s}\Big)\mathcal{S} = 0. \tag{69}$$

Differentiation of these equations yields Ward identities as for the massless case before.

To incorporate the asymptotic conditions (56-57) more efficiently, we introduce as before a modified action $\hat{\mathbf{I}}$

$$\hat{\mathbf{I}} = \mathbf{I} - f_\pi^2 \int d^4x\Big(s(x) + \frac{1}{2}a^\mu(x)\cdot a_\mu(x)\Big). \tag{70}$$

The new S-matrix $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ relates to the old S-matrix $\mathcal{S}$ through

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{S}\mathrm{exp}\Big(-if_\pi^2 \int d^4x\Big(s(x) + \frac{1}{2}a^\mu(x)\cdot a_\mu(x)\Big)\Big). \tag{71}$$

We further set $p = J/f_\pi - \nabla^\mu a_\mu$ and treat $\phi = (v_\mu^a,\ a_\mu^a,\ s\ ,J^a)$ as *independent* variables. Modified currents and densities may then be introduced as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{j}_V^{\mu a}(x) \quad &= \frac{\delta\hat{\mathbf{I}}}{\delta v_\mu^a(x)} = -i\hat{\mathcal{S}}^\dagger\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta v_\mu^a(x)}\\
\mathbf{j}_A^{\mu a}(x) \quad &= \frac{\delta\hat{\mathbf{I}}}{\delta a_\mu^a(x)} = -i\hat{\mathcal{S}}^\dagger\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a_\mu^a(x)}\\
\hat{\sigma}(x) \quad &= \frac{1}{f_\pi}\frac{\delta\hat{\mathbf{I}}}{\delta s(x)} = -\frac{i}{f_\pi}\hat{\mathcal{S}}^\dagger\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(x)}\\
\hat{\pi}^a(x) \quad &= \frac{\delta\hat{\mathbf{I}}}{\delta J^a(x)} = -i\hat{\mathcal{S}}^\dagger\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta J^a(x)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

Applying the chain rule

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta v_\mu^a(x)}|_p = \frac{\delta}{\delta v_\mu^a(x)}|_J + f_\pi \underline{a}^{\mu ac}(x)\frac{\delta}{\delta J^c(x)} \tag{73}$$

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta a_\mu^a(x)}|_p = \frac{\delta}{\delta a_\mu^a(x)}|_J - f_\pi \nabla^{\mu ac}(x)\frac{\delta}{\delta J^c(x)} \tag{74}$$

and so on to (70-71) yields

$$\mathbf{V}_\mu^a(x) = \mathbf{j}_{V\mu}^a(x) + f_\pi \underline{a}_\mu^{ac}(x)\hat{\pi}^c(x) \tag{75}$$

$$\mathbf{A}_\mu^a(x) = \mathbf{j}_{A\mu}^a(x) + f_\pi^2 a_\mu^a(x) - f_\pi(\nabla_\mu \hat{\pi})^a(x) \tag{76}$$

$$\sigma(x) = \hat{\sigma}(x) + f_\pi \tag{77}$$

$$\pi^a(x) = \hat{\pi}^a(x). \tag{78}$$

We observe that $\mathbf{j}_{A\mu}^a$ is again free of the asymptotic one-pion component by (56, 57, 67, 76).

Further differentiation also gives

$$\begin{aligned} T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}_\mu^a(x)\mathbf{V}_\nu^b(y)\Big) = \quad & T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{V\mu}^a(x)\mathbf{j}_{V\nu}^b(y)\Big) + f_\pi \underline{a}_\mu^{ac}(x)T^*\Big(\pi^c(x)\mathbf{j}_{V\nu}^b(y)\Big) \\ & + f_\pi \underline{a}_\nu^{bd}(y)T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{V\mu}^a(x)\pi^d(y)\Big) + f_\pi^2 \underline{a}_\mu^{ac}(x)\underline{a}_\nu^{bd}(y)T^*\Big(\pi^c(x)\pi^d(y)\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

$$\begin{aligned} T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}_\mu^a(x)\mathbf{A}_\nu^b(y)\Big) = \quad & T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{V\mu}^a(x)\mathbf{j}_{A\nu}^b(y)\Big) \\ & + f_\pi^2 a_\nu^b(y)\mathbf{j}_{V\mu}^a(x) + f_\pi^3 a_\nu^b(y)\underline{a}_\mu^{ac}(x)\pi^c(x) \\ & - i f_\pi \epsilon^{abc} g_{\mu\nu}\delta^4(x-y)\pi^c(x) + f_\pi \underline{a}_\mu^{ac}(x)T^*\Big(\pi^c(x)\mathbf{j}_{A\nu}^b(y)\Big) \\ & - f_\pi \nabla_\nu^{bd}(y)T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{V\mu}^a(x)\pi^d(y)\Big) - f_\pi^2 \underline{a}_\mu^{ac}(x)\nabla_\nu^{bd}(y)T^*\Big(\pi^c(x)\pi^d(y)\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

$$T^*\Big(\mathbf{A}_\mu^a(x)\mathbf{A}_\nu^b(y)\Big) = \quad -i f_\pi^2 \delta^4(x-y) g_{\mu\nu}\delta^{ab}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&+f_\pi^4 a_\mu^a(x)a_\nu^b(y) + f_\pi^2 a_\mu^a(x)\mathbf{j}_{A\nu}^b(y) + f_\pi^2\mathbf{j}_{A\mu}^a(x)a_\nu^b(y)\\&+T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{A\mu}^a(x)\mathbf{j}_{A\nu}^b(y)\Big) - f_\pi^3 a_\mu^a(x)\nabla_\nu^{bd}(y)\pi^d(y)\\&-f_\pi^3\nabla_\mu^{ac}(x)\pi^c(x)a_\nu^b(y) - f_\pi\nabla_\mu^{ac}(x)T^*\Big(\pi^c(x)\mathbf{j}_{A\nu}^b(y)\Big)\\&-f_\pi\nabla_\nu^{bd}(y)T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{A\mu}^a(x)\pi^d(y)\Big) + f_\pi^2\nabla_\mu^{ac}(x)\nabla_\nu^{bd}(y)T^*\Big(\pi^c(x)\pi^d(y)\Big)\end{aligned} \tag{81}$$

$$T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}_\mu^a(x)\pi^b(y)\Big) = T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{V\mu}^a(x)\pi^b(y)\Big) + f_\pi\underline{a}_\mu^{ac}(x)T^*\Big(\pi^c(x)\pi^b(y)\Big) \tag{82}$$

$$T^*\Big(\mathbf{A}_\mu^a(x)\pi^b(y)\Big) = T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{A\mu}^a(x)\pi^b(y)\Big) + f_\pi^2 a_\mu^a(x)\pi^b(y) - f_\pi\nabla_\mu^{ac}(x)T^*\Big(\pi^c(x)\pi^b(y)\Big). \tag{83}$$

Substitution of (75-78) into (66) gives (43) as before for the vector current and hence (53). For the axial current, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla^\mu\mathbf{j}_{A\mu} + \underline{a}^\mu\mathbf{j}_{V\mu} = \quad & -f_\pi^2\nabla^\mu a_\mu + f_\pi\nabla^\mu\nabla_\mu\pi - f_\pi\underline{a}^\mu\underline{a}_\mu\pi\\ & +f_\pi(m_\pi^2+s)\pi - (J - f_\pi\nabla^\mu a_\mu)(\hat\sigma + f_\pi).\end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

As before, we may introduce the Green's functions

$$\Big(-\nabla^\mu\nabla_\mu + \underline{a}^\mu\underline{a}_\mu - m_\pi^2 - s\Big)\,G_{R,A}(x,y) = \delta^4(x-y)\;\mathbf{1} \tag{85}$$

and

$$\mathbf{K} = \nabla^\mu\nabla_\mu - \underline{a}^\mu\underline{a}_\mu + s - \Box = 2\underline{v}^\mu\partial_\mu + (\partial^\mu\underline{v}_\mu) + \underline{v}^\mu\underline{v}_\mu - \underline{a}^\mu\underline{a}_\mu + s \tag{86}$$

associated with the quadratic action

$$\mathbf{I}_Q = \frac{1}{2}\int d^4x\Big((\nabla^\mu\pi)\cdot(\nabla_\mu\pi) - (\underline{a}^\mu\pi)\cdot(\underline{a}_\mu\pi) - (m_\pi^2+s)\pi\cdot\pi\Big). \tag{87}$$

The Green's functions obey

$$G_{R,A} = \Delta_{R,A} + \Delta_{R,A}\mathbf{K}G_{R,A} = \Delta_{R,A} + G_{R,A}\mathbf{K}\Delta_{R,A} \tag{88}$$

and (47) as before. Integration of (84) under the boundary conditions (56-57) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\pi = \quad & \Big(1+G_R\mathbf{K}\Big)\pi_{\rm in} - G_R J + G_R\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)\hat\sigma - \frac{1}{f_\pi}G_R\Big(\nabla^\mu\mathbf{j}_{A\mu} + \underline{a}^\mu\mathbf{j}_{V\mu}\Big)\\ = \quad & \Big(1+G_A\mathbf{K}\Big)\pi_{\rm out} - G_A J + G_A\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)\hat\sigma - \frac{1}{f_\pi}G_A\Big(\nabla^\mu\mathbf{j}_{A\mu} + \underline{a}^\mu\mathbf{j}_{V\mu}\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

The Peierls-Dyson formula and the Yang-Feldman relation may be used as before to convert (89) into

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta}{\delta J}\hat{\mathcal{S}} = \quad & -iG_R J\hat{\mathcal{S}} + i\hat{\mathcal{S}}\Big(1+G_R\mathbf{K}\Big)\pi_{in} \\ & +\frac{1}{f_\pi}G_R\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s} - \frac{1}{f_\pi}G_R\mathbf{X}_A\hat{\mathcal{S}} \\ = \quad & -iG_A J\hat{\mathcal{S}} + i\Big(1+G_A\mathbf{K}\Big)\pi_{\rm in}\hat{\mathcal{S}} \\ & +\frac{1}{f_\pi}G_A\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s} - \frac{1}{f_\pi}G_A\mathbf{X}_A\hat{\mathcal{S}}. \end{aligned} \tag{90}$$

This equation together with (53) constitute the desired master formulas for $SU(2)\times SU(2)$ symmetry with massive pions.

4.3. Chronological Products

The equation (90) allows us to express the Green's functions involving π fields in terms of $\mathbf{j}^a_{V\mu}$, $\mathbf{j}^a_{A\mu}$, $\hat{\sigma}$ and $\pi_{\rm in}$. Using the infinitesimal variations

$$\delta G_{R,A} = G_{R,A}\Big(\delta\mathbf{K}\Big)G_{R,A} \tag{91}$$

we find,

$$\begin{aligned} T^*\Big(\pi^a(x)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y)\Big) = \quad & -\hat{\mathcal{S}}^\dagger\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta J^a(x)\delta a^{\beta b}(y)} \\ = \quad & +iG^{ac}_R(x,y)\underline{a}^{cd}_\beta(y)\epsilon^{dbe}\pi^e(y) + i\nabla^{bc}_\beta(y)\Big(G^{ac}_R(x,y)\hat{\sigma}(y)\Big) \\ & +\frac{i}{f_\pi}G^{ac}_R(x,y)\epsilon^{cbd}\Big(\mathbf{j}^d_{V\beta}(y) + f_\pi\underline{a}^{de}_\beta(y)\pi^e(y)\Big) \\ & +\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y)\int d^4x'\Big(1+G_R\mathbf{K}\Big)^{ac}(x,x')\pi^c_{\rm in}(x') \\ & -\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y)\int d^4x' G^{ac}_R(x,x')J^c(x') \\ & +\int d^4x' G^{ac}_R(x,x')(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi)^c(x')T^*\Big(\hat{\sigma}(x')\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y)\Big) \\ & -\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4x' G^{ac}_R(x,x')\Big(\nabla^{\alpha cd}(x')T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^d_{A\alpha}(x')\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y)\Big) \\ & +\underline{a}^{\alpha cd}(x')T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^d_{V\alpha}(x')\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y)\Big)\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{92}$$

$$T^*\Big(\pi^a(x)\mathbf{j}^b_{V\beta}(y)\Big) = \quad -\hat{\mathcal{S}}^\dagger\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta J^a(x)\delta v^{\beta b}(y)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
= \quad & +iG_R^{ac}(x,y)\underline{a}_\beta^{cb}(y)\hat{\sigma}(y) \\
& +iG_R^{ac}(x,y)\Big(\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y^\beta}\epsilon^{cbd} - \underline{v}_\beta^{ce}(y)\epsilon^{ebd}\Big)\pi^d(y) \\
& +\frac{i}{f_\pi}G_R^{ac}(x,y)\epsilon^{cbd}\Big(\mathbf{j}_{A\beta}^d(y) - f_\pi\nabla_\beta^{de}(y)\pi^e(y)\Big) \\
& +\mathbf{j}_{V\beta}^b(y)\int d^4x'\Big(1+G_R\mathbf{K}\Big)^{ac}(x,x')\pi_{\rm in}^c(x') \\
& -\mathbf{j}_{V\beta}^b(y)\int d^4x' G_R^{ac}(x,x')J^c(x') \\
& +\int d^4x' G_R^{ac}(x,x')(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi)^c(x')T^*\Big(\hat{\sigma}(x')\mathbf{j}_{V\beta}^b(y)\Big) \\
& -\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4x' G_R^{ac}(x,x')\Big(\nabla^{\alpha cd}(x')T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{A\alpha}^d(x')\mathbf{j}_{V\beta}^b(y)\Big) \\
& +\underline{a}^{\alpha cd}(x')T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{V\alpha}^d(x')\mathbf{j}_{V\beta}^b(y)\Big)\Big)
\end{aligned} \tag{93}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
T^*\Big(\pi^a(x)\hat{\sigma}(y)\Big) = \quad & -\frac{1}{f_\pi}\hat{\mathcal{S}}^\dagger\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta J^a(x)\delta s(y)} \\
= \quad & -\frac{i}{f_\pi}G_R^{ac}(x,y)\pi^c(y) \\
& +\hat{\sigma}(y)\int d^4x'\Big(1+G_R\mathbf{K}\Big)^{ac}(x,x')\pi_{\rm in}^c(x') \\
& -\hat{\sigma}(y)\int d^4x' G_R^{ac}(x,x')J^c(x') \\
& +\int d^4x' G_R^{ac}(x,x')(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi)^c(x')T^*\Big(\hat{\sigma}(x')\hat{\sigma}(y)\Big) \\
& -\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4x' G_R^{ac}(x,x')\Big(\nabla^{\alpha cd}(x')T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{A\alpha}^d(x')\hat{\sigma}(y)\Big) \\
& +\underline{a}^{\alpha cd}(x')T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{V\alpha}^d(x')\hat{\sigma}(y)\Big)\Big)
\end{aligned} \tag{94}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
T^*\Big(\pi^a(x)\pi^b(y)\Big) = \quad & -\hat{\mathcal{S}}^\dagger\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta J^a(x)\delta J^b(y)} \\
= \quad & +iG_R^{ab}(x,y) + \frac{i}{f_\pi}G_R^{ab}(x,y)\hat{\sigma}(y) \\
& +\pi^b(y)\int d^4x'\Big(1+G_R\mathbf{K}\Big)^{ac}(x,x')\pi_{\rm in}^c(x') \\
& -\pi^b(y)\int d^4x' G_R^{ac}(x,x')J^c(x') \\
& +\int d^4x' G_R^{ac}(x,x')(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi)^c(x')T^*\Big(\hat{\sigma}(x')\pi^b(y)\Big) \\
& -\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4x' G_R^{ac}(x,x')\Big(\nabla^{\alpha cd}(x')T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{A\alpha}^d(x')\pi^b(y)\Big) \\
& +\underline{a}^{\alpha cd}(x')T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{V\alpha}^d(x')\pi^b(y)\Big)\Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{95}$$

4.4. Ward Identities

Ward identities may also be derived. For instance,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\Big(-\Box_x - m_\pi^2 - \mathbf{K}(x)\Big)^{ac}\Big(-\Box_y - m_\pi^2 - \mathbf{K}(y)\Big)^{bd} T^*\Big(\pi^c(x)\pi^d(y)\Big) = J^a(x)J^b(y) \\
&-J^a(x)\Big(\nabla^\nu a_\nu - J/f_\pi\Big)^b(y)\hat{\sigma}(y) - J^b(y)\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^a(x)\hat{\sigma}(y) \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi}J^a(x)\Big(\nabla^\beta \mathbf{j}_{A\beta} + \underline{a}^\beta \mathbf{j}_{V\beta}\Big)^b(y) + \frac{1}{f_\pi}J^b(y)\Big(\nabla^\beta \mathbf{j}_{A\beta} + \underline{a}^\beta \mathbf{j}_{V\beta}\Big)^a(x) \\
&+i\Big(-\Box_y - m_\pi^2 - \mathbf{K}(y)\Big)^{ba}\delta^4(x-y)\Big(1 + \frac{\hat{\sigma}(x)}{f_\pi}\Big) \\
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi}\Big(-\nabla^\alpha\nabla_\alpha + \underline{a}^\alpha\underline{a}_\alpha\Big)^{ab}(x)\delta^4(x-y)\hat{\sigma}(y) \\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^a(x)\pi^b(x)\delta^4(x-y) \\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}\nabla^{\alpha ac}(x)\delta^4(x-y)\underline{a}_\alpha^{bd}(y)\epsilon^{dce}\pi^e(y) \\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}\nabla^{\alpha ac}(x)\delta^4(x-y)\epsilon^{bce}\Big(\mathbf{j}_{V\alpha}^e(y) + f_\pi\underline{a}_\alpha^{ef}(y)\pi^f(y)\Big) \\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}\underline{a}^{\alpha ac}(x)\Big(\delta^4(x-y)\Big(\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial x^\alpha}\epsilon^{bce} - \underline{v}_\alpha^{bd}(x)\epsilon^{dce}\Big)\pi^e(x)\Big) \\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}\underline{a}^{\alpha ac}(x)\delta^4(x-y)\epsilon^{bce}\Big(\mathbf{j}_{A\alpha}^e(x) - f_\pi\nabla_\alpha^{ef}(x)\pi^f(x)\Big) \\
&+(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi)^a(x)(\nabla^\nu a_\nu - J/f_\pi)^b(y)T^*\Big(\hat{\sigma}(x)\hat{\sigma}(y)\Big) \\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi}(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi)^a(x)\Big(\nabla^{\alpha bd}(y)T^*\Big(\hat{\sigma}(x)\mathbf{j}_{A\alpha}^d(y)\Big) + \underline{a}^{\alpha bd}(y)T^*\Big(\hat{\sigma}(x)\mathbf{j}_{V\alpha}^d(y)\Big)\Big) \\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi}(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi)^b(y)\Big(\nabla^{\alpha ac}(x)T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{A\alpha}^c(x)\hat{\sigma}(y)\Big) + \underline{a}^{\alpha ac}(x)T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{V\alpha}^c(x)\hat{\sigma}(y)\Big)\Big) \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\Big(\nabla^{\alpha ac}(x)\nabla^{\beta bd}(y)T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{A\alpha}^c(x)\mathbf{j}_{A\beta}^d(y)\Big) + \nabla^{\alpha ac}(x)\underline{a}^{\beta bd}(y)T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{A\alpha}^c(x)\mathbf{j}_{V\beta}^d(y)\Big) \\
&+\underline{a}^{\alpha ac}(x)\nabla^{\beta bd}(y)T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{V\alpha}^c(x)\mathbf{j}_{A\beta}^d(y)\Big) + \underline{a}^{\alpha ac}(x)\underline{a}^{\beta bd}(y)T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{V\alpha}^c(x)\mathbf{j}_{V\beta}^d(y)\Big)\Big).
\end{aligned}
\tag{96}
$$

Further results will be given in the next section and in Appendix D.

5. The Goldberger-Treiman Relation

From (76) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
< N(p_2)|\mathbf{A}_\mu^a(x)|N(p_1) >= \quad & -if_\pi(p_2-p_1)_\mu < N(p_2)|\pi^a(x)|N(p_1) > \\
& + < N(p_2)|\mathbf{j}_{A\mu}^a(x)|N(p_1) >
\end{aligned}
\tag{97}
$$

Introducing the nucleon axial form factor

$$< N(p_2)|\mathbf{A}^a_\mu(x)|N(p_1) >= \overline{u}(p_2)\Big(\gamma_\mu\gamma_5\, G_1(t) + (p_2-p_1)_\mu\gamma_5\, G_2(t)\Big)\frac{\tau^a}{2}\; u(p_1)e^{i(p_2-p_1)\cdot x} \tag{98}$$

with $t=(p_1-p_2)^2$, we have

$$< N(p_2)|\mathbf{j}^a_{A\mu}(x)|N(p_1) >= \overline{u}(p_2)\Big(\gamma_\mu\gamma_5\, G_1(t) + (p_2-p_1)_\mu\gamma_5\, \overline{G}_2(t)\Big)\frac{\tau^a}{2}\; u(p_1)e^{i(p_2-p_1)\cdot x} \tag{99}$$

where G_1 and $\overline{G}_2$ are free of pion poles.

On the other hand, the master formula (89) gives

$$\begin{aligned} < N(p_2)|\pi^a(x)|N(p_1) >= \quad & + < N(p_2)|\pi^a_{\rm in}(x)|N(p_1) > \\ & -\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4y\, \Delta_R(x-y) < N(p_2)|\partial^\mu \mathbf{j}^a_{A\mu}(y)|N(p_1) > \\ = \quad & -\frac{1}{f_\pi}\frac{1}{t-m_\pi^2}\overline{u}(p_2)\Big(2Mi\gamma_5 G_1(t) + it\gamma_5\overline{G}_2(t)\Big)\,\frac{\tau^a}{2}\,u(p_1)\, e^{i(p_2-p_1)\cdot x} \end{aligned} \tag{100}$$

This is by definition

$$-\, g_{\pi NN}(t)\frac{1}{t-m_\pi^2}\overline{u}(p_2)i\gamma_5\tau^a u(p_1)\, e^{i(p_2-p_1)\cdot x} \tag{101}$$

where the minus sign corresponds to the coupling $\mathcal{L} = g_{\pi NN}\overline{N}i\gamma_5\tau^a N\,\pi^a$ in the effective Lagrangian. Hence,

$$f_\pi g_{\pi NN}(0) = M g_A \tag{102}$$

where $g_A = G_1(0)$ is the nucleon axial charge. Extrapolating $g_{\pi NN}$ to the physical value $g_{\pi NN} = g_{\pi NN}(m_\pi^2)$ yields the Goldberger-Treiman relation.

6. Chiral Reduction Formula

6.1. Single Commutator

To extract results from the master formula, we multiply (90) by $(1+G_A\mathbf{K})^{-1} = 1-\Delta_A\mathbf{K}$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Big[\pi_{\rm in}, \hat{\mathcal{S}}\Big] = \quad & +\hat{\mathcal{S}}\Delta\Big(1+\mathbf{K}G_R\Big)\mathbf{K}\pi_{\rm in} - \Delta\Big(1+\mathbf{K}G_R\Big)J\hat{\mathcal{S}} \\ & -\frac{i}{f_\pi}\Delta\Big(1+\mathbf{K}G_R\Big)\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s} + \frac{i}{f_\pi}\Delta\Big(1+\mathbf{K}G_R\Big)\mathbf{X}_A\hat{\mathcal{S}}. \end{aligned} \tag{103}$$

The Fourier decompositions (4, 6) then give

$$\begin{aligned}\Big[a_{\rm in}^a(k), \hat{\mathcal{S}}\Big] = \quad & -i\hat{\mathcal{S}}\int d^4y d^4z e^{ik\cdot y}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}G_R\Big)^{ac}(y,z)(\mathbf{K}\pi_{\rm in})^c(z) \\ & +i\int d^4y d^4z e^{ik\cdot y}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}G_R\Big)^{ac}(y,z)J^c(z)\hat{\mathcal{S}} \\ & -\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4y d^4z e^{ik\cdot y}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}G_R\Big)^{ac}(y,z)\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^c(z)\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(z)} \\ & +\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4y d^4z e^{ik\cdot y}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}G_R\Big)^{ac}(y,z)\mathbf{X}_A^c(z)\hat{\mathcal{S}} \end{aligned} \tag{104}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Big[\hat{\mathcal{S}}, a_{\rm in}^{a\dagger}(k)\Big] = \quad & -i\hat{\mathcal{S}}\int d^4y d^4z e^{-ik\cdot y}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}G_R\Big)^{ac}(y,z)(\mathbf{K}\pi_{\rm in})^c(z) \\ & +i\int d^4y d^4z e^{-ik\cdot y}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}G_R\Big)^{ac}(y,z)J^c(z)\hat{\mathcal{S}} \\ & -\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4y d^4z e^{-ik\cdot y}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}G_R\Big)^{ac}(y,z)\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^c(z)\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(z)} \\ & +\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4y d^4z e^{-ik\cdot y}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}G_R\Big)^{ac}(y,z)\mathbf{X}_A^c(z)\hat{\mathcal{S}}. \end{aligned} \tag{105}$$

The master equations in Fourier form have the structure of reduction formulas. In particular, to lowest order in the external fields $\phi = (v, a, J, s)$,

$$<\beta\ {\rm in}|\Big[a_{\rm in}^a(k), \mathbf{S}\Big]|\alpha\ {\rm in}> = +\frac{1}{f_\pi}k^\alpha\int d^4y e^{+ik\cdot y} <\beta\ {\rm in}|\mathbf{S}\,\mathbf{j}_{A\alpha}^a(y)|\alpha\ {\rm in}> \tag{106}$$

$$<\beta\ {\rm in}|\Big[\mathbf{S}, a_{\rm in}^{a\dagger}(k)\Big]|\alpha\ {\rm in}> = -\frac{1}{f_\pi}k^\alpha\int d^4y e^{-ik\cdot y} <\beta\ {\rm in}|\mathbf{S}\,\mathbf{j}_{A\alpha}^a(y)|\alpha\ {\rm in}>, \tag{107}$$

where $\mathbf{S} = \mathcal{S}|_{\phi=0} = \hat{\mathcal{S}}|_{\phi=0}$ is the on-shell S-matrix. Equations (106-107) define an off-shell extension of $\mathbf{S}$. The Adler consistency condition and crossing symmetry are manifest.

6.2. Double Commutator

For the double commutator

$$\Big[a_{\rm in}^b(k_2), \Big[\mathbf{S}, a_{\rm in}^{a\dagger}(k_1)\Big]\Big] = +\frac{i}{f_\pi}k_{1\alpha}\int d^4y e^{-ik_1\cdot y}\Big[a_{\rm in}^b(k_2), \frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a_\alpha^a(y)}\Big] \tag{108}$$

we need the result

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\delta}{\delta a_\alpha^a(y)}\Big[a_{\rm in}^b(k_2), \hat{\mathcal{S}}\Big] = \quad & -\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{ik_2\cdot y}\delta^{ab}\Big(-\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\alpha} - \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y^\alpha}\Big)\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(y)} \\ & +\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4y_2 e^{ik_2\cdot y_2}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_2^\beta}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a_\beta^b(y_2)\delta a_\alpha^a(y)} + \frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{ik_2\cdot y}\epsilon^{bae}\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta v_\alpha^e(y)}\end{aligned}$$

$$= \quad +e^{ik_2\cdot y}\delta^{ab}\Big(\partial^\alpha + ik_2^\alpha\Big)i\mathbf{S}\hat{\sigma}(y)$$

$$-\frac{i}{f_\pi}k_{2\beta}\int d^4y_2 e^{ik_2\cdot y_2}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a_\beta^b(y_2)\delta a_\alpha^a(y)} + \frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{ik_2\cdot y}\epsilon^{bae}i\mathbf{S}\mathbf{V}^{\alpha e}(y) \quad (109)$$

to leading order in the external fields. Thus (108) reduces to

$$\Big[a_{\rm in}^b(k_2), \Big[\mathbf{S}, a_{\rm in}^{a\dagger}(k_1)\Big]\Big] =$$

$$-\frac{i}{f_\pi}m_\pi^2\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y}\mathbf{S}\hat{\sigma}(y)\delta^{ab} + \frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_1^\alpha\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y}\epsilon^{abe}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{V}^{\alpha e}(y)$$

$$+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_{1\alpha}k_{2\beta}\int d^4y_1 d^4y_2 e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1+ik_2\cdot y_2}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a_\alpha^a(y_1)\delta a_\beta^b(y_2)}. \quad (110)$$

For later use, we quote the crossed version of (109)

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta a_\beta^b(y)}\Big[\hat{\mathcal{S}}, a_{\rm in}^{a\dagger}(k_1)\Big] = e^{-ik_1\cdot y}\delta^{ab}\Big(\partial^\beta - ik_1^\beta\Big)i\mathbf{S}\hat{\sigma}(y)$$

$$+\frac{i}{f_\pi}k_{1\alpha}\int d^4y_1 e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a_\alpha^a(y_1)\delta a_\beta^b(y)} + \frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{-ik_1\cdot y}\epsilon^{abe}i\mathbf{S}\mathbf{V}^{\beta e}(y). \quad (111)$$

The fact that $\mathbf{j}_{A\mu}^a$ is free of one-pion components also implies

$$0 = i < 0|\Big[a_{\rm in}^b(k_2), \mathbf{S}\mathbf{j}_{A\alpha}^a(y)\Big]|0 >= \frac{\delta}{\delta a^{\alpha a}(y)} < 0|\Big[a_{\rm in}^b(k_2), \hat{\mathcal{S}}\Big]|0 >=$$

$$-e^{ik_2\cdot y}\delta^{ab}k_{2\alpha} < 0|\hat{\sigma}|0 > +\frac{i}{f_\pi}k_2^\beta e^{ik_2\cdot y}\int d^4y_2 e^{ik_2\cdot y_2} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{A\alpha}^a(0)\mathbf{j}_{A\beta}^b(y_2)\Big)|0 > \quad (112)$$

where we have made explicit use of (109) and translational invariance of vacuum expectation values. The crossed result reads

$$0 = i < 0|\Big[\mathbf{S}\mathbf{j}_{A\beta}^b(y), a_{\rm in}^{a\dagger}(k_1)\Big]|0 >=$$

$$+e^{-ik_1\cdot y}\delta^{ab}k_{1\beta} < 0|\hat{\sigma}|0 > -\frac{i}{f_\pi}k_1^\alpha e^{-ik_1\cdot y}\int d^4y_1 e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{A\alpha}^a(y_1)\mathbf{j}_{A\beta}^b(0)\Big)|0 > \quad (113)$$

Energy-momentum conservation and (112-113) suffice to guarantee the stability of the one pion state $[\mathbf{S}, a_{\rm in}^{a\dagger}(k)]|0 >= 0$.

7. Pion-Nucleon Scattering : $\pi N \to \pi N$

The equation (110) may be applied to πN scattering. Indeed, sandwiched between one-nucleon states, it becomes

$$< N(p_2)|a_{\rm in}^b(k_2)(\mathbf{S}-\mathbf{1})a_{\rm in}^{a\dagger}(k_1)|N(p_1) >=< N(p_2)|\Big[a_{\rm in}^b(k_2), \Big[\mathbf{S}, a_{\rm in}^{a\dagger}(k_1)\Big]\Big]|N(p_1) >=$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi} m_\pi^2 \delta^{ab} \int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y} < N(p_2)|\hat{\sigma}(y)|N(p_1) > \\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^2} k_1^\alpha k_2^\beta \int d^4y_1 d^4y_2 e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1 + ik_2\cdot y_1} < N(p_2)|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(y_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y_2)\Big)|N(p_1) > \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2} k_1^\alpha \int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y} \epsilon^{abe} < N(p_2)|\mathbf{V}^e_\alpha(y)|N(p_1) > \qquad (114)
\end{aligned}
$$

In (114), we have assumed that $a^b_{\rm in}(k_2)|N(p_1) >= 0$ as well as the stability of the one-nucleon state $\mathbf{S}|N(p_1) >= |N(p_1) >$. As a check of (114), we note that the same result is obtained from the conventional WLSZ reduction formula[2] and the Ward identity (96). We also note that the disconnected part

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi} m_\pi^2 \delta^{ab} \int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y} < 0|\hat{\sigma}(y)|0 >< N(p_2)|N(p_1) > \\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^2} k_1^\alpha k_2^\beta \int d^4y_1 d^4y_2 e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y_1} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(y_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y_2)\Big)|0 >< N(p_2)|N(p_1) >
\end{aligned} \qquad (115)
$$

vanishes by (112-113).

Eq. (114) implies that the part of the amplitude that is even under $a \leftrightarrow b$ is quadratic in the momenta $k \sim m_\pi$, while the odd part is linear in the momenta. Since $\mathbf{V}^a_\mu$ reduces to the isospin operator in the limit of vanishing momentum transfer $k_1 - k_2 \to 0$, the amplitude evaluated at threshold gives the Tomozawa-Weinberg relation [17, 3] for the S-wave scattering lengths a_{ab},

$$
a_{ab} = \frac{-i}{\pi}\Big(\frac{M}{M+m_\pi}\Big)\frac{m_\pi}{f_\pi^2}\,\epsilon^{abc} < N|\tau^c|N > \qquad (116)
$$

where M is the nucleon mass. Specifically, if we denote by $i\mathcal{T}^{ab}(\omega)$ the forward on-shell πN scattering amplitude (114) for a nucleon at rest,

$$
< N(p)|a^b_{\rm in}(k)(\mathbf{S}-\mathbf{1})a^{a\dagger}_{\rm in}(k)|N(p) >= (2\pi)^4\delta^4(p+k-p-k)i\mathcal{T}^{ab}(\omega = k^0) \qquad (117)
$$

then by isospin symmetry

$$
i\mathcal{T}^{ab}(\omega) = \overline{u}(p)\Big(i\mathcal{T}^+(\omega)\delta^{ba} + i\mathcal{T}^-(\omega)\ i\epsilon^{bac}\tau^c\Big)u(p) \qquad (118)
$$

The even-odd S-wave scattering lengths $a^\pm$ are defined to be

$$
\mathcal{T}^\pm(m_\pi) = 4\pi\Big(1+\frac{m_\pi}{M}\Big)\ a^\pm \qquad (119)
$$

---

[2] W stands for Watanabe [16].

To lowest order $a^+ = 0$ and $a^- = 8.76\, 10^{-2}\, m_\pi^{-1}$ in good agreement with $a^+(\mathrm{exp}) = (-0.83 \pm 0.38) \times 10^{-2} \mathrm{m}_\pi^{-1}$ and $a^-(\mathrm{exp}) = (+9.17 \pm 0.17) \times 10^{-2} \mathrm{m}_\pi^{-1}$. The empirical results are extracted from forward πN scattering and pionic atom data.

Combining (116) with the Goldberger-Miyazawa-Oehme sum rule [18]

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{3}\Big(\frac{1}{m_\pi} + \frac{1}{M}\Big)\Big(a_{1/2} - a_{3/2}\Big) = \quad & +\frac{1}{\pi}\Big(\frac{g_{\pi NN}}{2M}\Big)^2 \Big(1 - \frac{m_\pi^2}{4M^2}\Big)^{-1} \\ & -\frac{1}{2\pi^2}\int_{m_\pi}^{\infty} \frac{d\nu}{\sqrt{\nu^2 - m_\pi^2}}\Big(\sigma_{\pi^+ p}(\nu) - \sigma_{\pi^- p}(\nu)\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{120}$$

and using the Goldberger-Treiman relation $g_A = f_\pi g_{\pi NN}/M$, give

$$\frac{1}{g_A^2} = \Big(1 - \frac{m_\pi^2}{4M^2}\Big)^{-1} + \frac{1}{2\pi}\Big(\frac{2M}{g_{\pi NN}}\Big)^2 \int_{m_\pi}^{\infty} \frac{d\nu}{\sqrt{\nu^2 - m_\pi^2}}\Big(\sigma_{\pi^- p}(\nu) - \sigma_{\pi^+ p}(\nu)\Big) \tag{121}$$

which is one form of the Adler-Weisberger sum rule [19]. Here $\sigma_{\pi^\pm p}$ are the total cross sections for the elastic $\pi^\pm p \to \pi^\pm p$ reactions. The sum rule (121) can be verified to a good accuracy using the Karlsruhe-Helsinki data for the elastic cross sections.

8. Pion Photo- and Electro-Production : $\gamma N \to \pi N$

Another process of interest is the photo- or electro-production reaction. The isovector part of the amplitude is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \int d^4y_1 e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1} < N(p_2)| a^b_{\mathrm{in}}(k_2) \mathbf{S} \mathbf{V}^a_\alpha(y_1) |N(p_1) >= \\ & + i k_{2\alpha} \epsilon^{baf} \int d^4 y e^{-i(k_1 - k_2)\cdot y} < N(p_2)|\pi^f(y)|N(p_1) > \\ & + \frac{1}{f_\pi}\epsilon^{baf} \int d^4 y e^{-i(k_1 - k_2)\cdot y} < N(p_2)|\mathbf{A}^f_\alpha(y)|N(p_1) > \\ & + \frac{1}{f_\pi} k_2^\beta \int d^4y_1 d^4y_2 e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1 + ik_2\cdot y_2} < N(p_2)| T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^a_\alpha(y_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y_2)\Big)|N(p_1) > \end{aligned} \tag{122}$$

where we have used (165). We may evaluate (122) for the isospin 3/2 channel, where there is no contribution from the isoscalar part of the current. The third term involving $\mathbf{j}^a_{A\mu}$ is one power of momentum higher than the second term with $\mathbf{A}^a_\mu$ and will be ignored. The first term with π also carries an extra power of momentum, but it cannot be dropped since it contains a pole.

Using the axial form factor (98) and factoring out $(2\pi)^4 \delta^4(k_1 + p_1 - k_2 - p_2)$, give

$$\begin{aligned} & + i k_{2\alpha}\epsilon^{baf} < N(p_2)|\pi^f(0)|N(p_1) > \\ & + \frac{1}{f_\pi}\epsilon^{baf}\overline{u}(p_2)\Big(\gamma_\alpha\gamma_5\, G_1(t) + (k_1 - k_2)_\alpha \gamma_5\, G_2(t)\Big)\frac{\tau^f}{2}\, u(p_1) \end{aligned} \tag{123}$$

At threshold $t = -m_\pi^2 + k_1^2 + \mathcal{O}(m_\pi/M)$, we may replace $< N(p_2)|\pi^f(0)|N(p_1) >$ and $G_2(t)$ by their pole terms

$$< N(p_2)|\pi^f(0)|N(p_1) > \to -g_{\pi NN}\frac{1}{t-m_\pi^2}\overline{u}(p_2)i\gamma_5\tau^f u(p_1) \tag{124}$$

$$G_2(t) \to -2f_\pi g_{\pi NN}\frac{1}{t-m_\pi^2} \tag{125}$$

and $G_1(t)$ by the axial coupling $G_1(0) = g_A = 1.25$, to obtain

$$\Big(2ik_{2\alpha} - ik_{1\alpha}\Big)\epsilon^{baf}\frac{g_{\pi NN}}{2m_\pi^2 - k_1^2}\overline{u}(p_2)i\gamma_5\tau^f u(p_1) + \frac{1}{f_\pi}\epsilon^{baf}g_A\overline{u}(p_2)\gamma_\alpha\gamma_5\frac{\tau^f}{2}u(p_1) \tag{126}$$

We note that the pole term simply corresponds to Fig. 1a. Also, it may be checked that current conservation is satisfied by virtue of the Goldberger-Treiman relation and

$$\overline{u}(p_2)k_2 \cdot \gamma\gamma_5\tau^f u(p_1) = \mathcal{O}(m_\pi^2/M)\ u^\dagger(p_2)\,u(p_1) \tag{127}$$

The result (126) is consistent with the Kroll-Ruderman theorem for photoproduction [20], and shows that the isospin 3/2 amplitudes $\gamma p \to \pi^+ n$ and $\gamma n \to \pi^- n$ are totally fixed at threshold by chiral symmetry. This is not the case for the isospin 1/2 channel that is $\gamma p \to \pi^0 p$, for which the Kroll-Ruderman term drops. This process also receives contribution from the isoscalar part of the electromagnetic current and thus requires a full $SU(3) \times SU(3)$ calculation. This will be discussed elsewhere [25]. We note that since our treatment of electromagnetism is first order in the electromagnetic charge, the Primakoff term in (126) is absent.

Finally, we would like to note that the neutral pion photoproduction experiments carried out at Saclay [21] and Mainz [22] on proton targets, $\gamma p \to \pi^0 p$, have questioned some current algebra results at threshold, although the new data from Mainz [23] for π^0 electroproduction seems to indicate otherwise. Further data on these issues are expected from the SAL collaboration at Saskatoon. Given the experimental interest in pion photo- and electro-production near threshold, there has been some recent theoretical activity in this direction using heavy-baryon chiral perturbation theory [24]. While our results provide exact constraints at threshold, our formalism has to be extended to baryon intermediate states to account properly for near-threshold effects. We will report on some of these issues elsewhere [25].

9. Two-Pion Pion-Production : $\pi N \to \pi\pi N$

We may also consider the two-pion production $\pi N \to \pi\pi N$ amplitude

$$
\begin{aligned}
&< N(p_2)|a^c_{\rm in}(k_3)a^b_{\rm in}(k_2)\mathbf{S}a^{a\dagger}_{\rm in}(k_1)|N(p_1) >= \\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}m_\pi^2\delta^{ab}\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y} < N(p_2)|a^c_{\rm in}(k_3)\mathbf{S}\hat{\sigma}(y)|N(p_1) > \ + 2 \text{ perm.} \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_2^\alpha\epsilon^{abe}\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y} < N(p_2)|a^c_{\rm in}(k_3)\mathbf{S}\mathbf{V}^e_\alpha(y)|N(p_1) > + \ 2 \text{ perm} \\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}m_\pi^2\delta^{ac}\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2-k_3)\cdot y} < N(p_2)|\pi^b(y)|N(p_1) > \\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}m_\pi^2\delta^{bc}\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2-k_3)\cdot y} < N(p_2)|\pi^a(y)|N(p_1) > \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^3}k_1^\alpha\epsilon^{cae}\epsilon^{bef}\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2-k_3)\cdot y} < N(p_2)|\mathbf{A}^f_\alpha(y)|N(p_1) > \\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^3}k_2^\beta\epsilon^{cbe}\epsilon^{aef}\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2-k_3)\cdot y} < N(p_2)|\mathbf{A}^f_\beta(y)|N(p_1) > \\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^3}k_1^\alpha k_2^\beta k_3^\gamma\int d^4y_1 d^4y_2 d^4y_3 e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1+ik_2\cdot y_2+ik_3\cdot y_3} \\
&\times < N(p_2)|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(y_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y_2)\mathbf{j}^c_{A\gamma}(y_3)\Big)|N(p_1) >
\end{aligned}
\tag{128}
$$

where we have used the crossed version of (167). The term with three $\mathbf{j}^a_{A\mu}$'s is three pion reduced and cubic in the momenta, so it will be ignored. In the isospin 3/2 channel, the term with $\hat{\sigma}$ does not contribute. In the same channel, the contribution involving $\mathbf{V}^a_\mu$ is quadratic in the momenta, since $\mathbf{V}^a_\mu$ at zero momentum is proportional to the isospin operator, which does not change the total isospin of the nucleon 1/2. Hence, the dominant contribution at low momentum is given by the terms with $\mathbf{A}^a_\mu$ and π. Using (98,124,125) and $G_1(t) \to g_A$ as before and factoring out the momentum delta function, we obtain for the isospin 3/2 channel of (128) at threshold

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{i}{4f_\pi^2}\delta^{ac}g_{\pi NN}\ \overline{u}(p_2)i\gamma_5\tau^b u(p_1) \\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^3}\delta^{bc}g_A k_1^\alpha\ \overline{u}(p_2)\gamma_\alpha\gamma_5\frac{\tau^a}{2}u(p_1) \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^3}\delta^{ab}g_A k_1^\alpha\ \overline{u}(p_2)\gamma_\alpha\gamma_5\frac{\tau^c}{2}u(p_1) \\
&+\frac{i}{4m_\pi^2 f_\pi^2}\delta^{bc}g_{\pi NN}k_1\cdot(p_2-p_1)\ \overline{u}(p_2)i\gamma_5\tau^a u(p_1)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{i}{4m_\pi^2 f_\pi^2}\delta^{ab} g_{\pi NN} k_1 \cdot (p_2 - p_1)\ \overline{u}(p_2) i\gamma_5 \tau^c u(p_1) \\
&+\Big(k_1\ \ a \leftrightarrow -k_2\ \ b\Big) \qquad (129)
\end{aligned}
$$

which may be checked to be totally symmetric by the Goldberger-Treiman relation.

The process has also been treated by Chang [26] in the soft pion limit. A chiral calculation has been made by Beringer [27], and heavy-baryon chiral perturbation theory has been applied by Bernard, Kaiser and Meissner [28].

New data on $\pi^+ p \to \pi^+\pi^+ n$ and $\pi^- p \to \pi^0\pi^0 n$ reactions are now available in the threshold region, with pion energies as large as 200 MeV in the lab frame [32]. These new measurements complement the high statistics measurements of $\pi^- p \to \pi^-\pi^+ n$ at 17.2 GeV carried out at CERN [29], and the $\pi^+ n \to \pi^+\pi^- p$ measurement at 5.98 GeV and 11.85 GeV on polarised deuterons also carried out at CERN [30]. We will report on these calculations and data in the context of our framework including nucleon intermediate states elsewhere [25].

We note that since the reaction $\pi N \to \pi\pi N$ has been conventionally used to extract the S-wave $\pi\pi$ scattering length [32], we may ask to what extent this extraction depends on the model used. Indeed our result (128) shows exactly how this amplitude is related to other pion-nucleon amplitudes under the dictates of chiral symmetry and unitarity. From (128) it appears that the S-wave $\pi\pi$ scattering amplitude (see below) does not factorize out of $\pi N \to \pi\pi N$ in the t-channel. This means that the present extractions can only be performed in a scheme dependent way. In fact these extractions have been recently questioned by Svec [31].

Finally, it has been suggested that the two experiments $\pi^- p_\uparrow \to \pi^-\pi^+ n$ at 17.2 GeV, and $\pi^+ n_\uparrow \to \pi^+\pi^- p$ at 5.98 GeV and 11.85 GeV on polarized targets, show evidence for a low lying scalar state $0^{++}(750)$ with a width of 250 MeV [31]. It would be interesting to see whether this can follow from the general principles we have presently used when nucleon intermediate states are also included.

11. Pion Emission in Compton Scattering : $\gamma N \to \gamma\pi N$

The amplitude for the reaction $\gamma N \to \gamma\pi N$ may be written as

$$
+\int d^4y_1 d^4y_2 e^{-iq_1\cdot y_1 + iq_2\cdot y_2} < N(p_2)|a^a_{\rm in}(k)\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y_1)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(y_2)\Big)|N(p_1) >
$$

$$= \quad -\int d^4y_1 d^4y_2 e^{-iq_1\cdot y_1+iq_2\cdot y_2} < N(p_2)|\frac{\delta^2}{\delta v^{\mu c}(y_1)\delta v^{\nu d}(y_2)}\Big[a^a_{\rm in}(k),\hat{\mathcal{S}}\Big]|N(p_1)> \qquad (130)$$

in the isospin 3/2 channel. To evaluate (130) we note that differentiating the one-pion reduction formula

$$\Big[a^a_{\rm in}(k),\hat{\mathcal{S}}\Big] = \frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4yd^4ze^{ik\cdot y}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{ae}(y,z)\ \mathbf{X}^e_A(z)\hat{\mathcal{S}} + \mathcal{O}\Big(J,a,\pi_{\rm in}\Big) \qquad (131)$$

yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\delta^2}{\delta v^{\mu c}(y_1)\delta v^{\nu d}(y_2)}\Big[a^a_{\rm in}(k),\hat{\mathcal{S}}\Big] = \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{ik\cdot y_1}g_{\mu\nu}\delta^4(y_1-y_2)\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{edf}\int d^4z\Delta_R(y_1-z)\frac{\partial}{\partial z_\alpha}i\mathbf{S}\mathbf{j}^f_{A\alpha}(z) \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{ik\cdot y_1}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_1^\mu}-ik_\mu\Big)\epsilon^{ace}\Delta_R(y_1-y_2)\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_2^\nu}-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y_2^\nu}\Big)\epsilon^{edf} \\
&\times\int d^4z\Delta_R(y_1-z)\frac{\partial}{\partial z_\alpha}i\mathbf{S}\mathbf{j}^f_{A\alpha}(z) \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{ik\cdot y_1}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_1^\mu}-ik_\mu\Big)\epsilon^{ace}\Delta_R(y_1-y_2)\epsilon^{edf}i\mathbf{S}\mathbf{j}^f_{A\nu}(y_2) \\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{ik\cdot y_1}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_1^\mu}-ik_\mu\Big)\epsilon^{ace}\int d^4z\Delta_R(y_1-z)\frac{\partial}{\partial z_\alpha}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^e_{A\alpha}(z)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(y_2)\Big) \\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{ik\cdot y_1}\epsilon^{ace}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^e_{A\mu}(y_1)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(y_2)\Big) \\
&+\Big(y_1\ \ c\ \ \mu\leftrightarrow y_2\ \ d\ \ \nu\Big) \\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4ye^{ik\cdot y}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_\alpha}i\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(y)\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y_1)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(y_2)\Big) \\
&+\mathcal{O}\Big(J,a,\pi_{\rm in}\Big) \qquad (132)
\end{aligned}$$

Counting ∂ as $\mathcal{O}(k)$ and Δ as $\mathcal{O}(k^{-2})$, the low momentum behaviour of (130) follows from the first three terms of (132). Using (99) and dividing out by $(2\pi)^4\delta^4(p_1+q_1-p_2-q_2-k)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{g_A}{f_\pi}g_{\mu\nu}\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{edf}\frac{1}{(k+q_2-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2}(p_2-p_1)^\alpha\ \overline{u}(p_2)\gamma_\alpha\gamma_5\frac{\tau^f}{2}u(p_1) \\
&-\frac{g_A}{f_\pi}(2k_\mu-q_{1\mu})(2k_\nu-2q_{1\nu}+q_{2\nu})\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{edf}\frac{1}{(k-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2} \\
&\quad\times\frac{1}{(k+q_2-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2}(p_2-p_1)^\alpha\ \overline{u}(p_2)\gamma_\alpha\gamma_5\frac{\tau^f}{2}u(p_1) \\
&-\frac{g_A}{f_\pi}(2k_\mu-q_{1\mu})\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{edf}\frac{1}{(k-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2}\ \overline{u}(p_2)\gamma_\nu\gamma_5\frac{\tau^f}{2}u(p_1) \\
&+\Big(q_1\ \ c\ \ \mu\leftrightarrow -q_2\ \ d\ \ \nu\Big) \qquad (133)
\end{aligned}$$

The threshold contributions (133) are shown in Fig. 2. We note that the (strong) radiative corrections are subleading effects at threshold. The reaction $\gamma p \to \gamma\pi^+ n$ has been analysed at Lebedev [33] in the kinematical regime where the t-channel pion pole dominates. The experiment at Lebedev was used to extract the pion polarisabilities (see below).

11. Two-Pion Photo- and Electro-Production : $\gamma N \to \pi\pi N$

Finally, consider the two-pion photo- and electro-production $\gamma N \to \pi\pi N$ reaction. The isovector part of the amplitude is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int d^4y e^{-iq\cdot y} < N(p_2)|a^a_{\rm in}(k_1)a^b_{\rm in}(k_2)\mathbf{S}\mathbf{V}^a_\mu(y)|N(p_1)>_{\rm conn.}= \\
&< N(p_2)|(-i)\int d^4y e^{-iq\cdot y}\frac{\delta}{\delta v^{\mu c}(y)}\Big[a^a_{\rm in}(k_1), \Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2), \hat{\mathcal{S}}\Big]\Big]|N(p_1)>_{\rm conn.} \qquad (134)
\end{aligned}$$

As before, we consider the isospin 3/2 channel where the isoscalar part of the current does not contribute. Iteration of (104) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big[a^a_{\rm in}(k_1), \Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2), \hat{\mathcal{S}}\Big]\Big] = \\
&-i\Big[a^a_{\rm in}(k_1), \hat{\mathcal{S}}\Big]\int d^4y_2 d^4z_2 e^{ik_2\cdot y_2}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{bf}(y_2,z_2)\Big(\mathbf{K}\pi_{\rm in}\Big)^f(z_2) \\
&-i\hat{\mathcal{S}}\int d^4y_2 d^4z_2 e^{ik_2\cdot y_2}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{bf}(y_2,z_2)\Big[a^a_{\rm in}(k_1), \Big(\mathbf{K}\pi_{\rm in}\Big)^f(z_2)\Big] \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4y_2 d^4z_2 e^{ik_2\cdot y_2}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{bf}(y_2,z_2)\mathbf{X}^f_A(z_2)\Big[a^a_{\rm in}(k_1), \hat{\mathcal{S}}\Big] \\
&+\mathcal{O}(J,a) \qquad (135)
\end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big[a^a_{\rm in}(k_1), \Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2), \hat{\mathcal{S}}\Big]\Big] = \\
&-\hat{\mathcal{S}}\int d^4y_1 d^4z_1 e^{ik_1\cdot y_1}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{ae}(y_1,z_1)\Big(\mathbf{K}\pi_{\rm in}\Big)^e(z_1) \\
&\times\int d^4y_2 d^4z_2 e^{ik_2\cdot y_2}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{bf}(y_2,z_2)\Big(\mathbf{K}\pi_{\rm in}\Big)^f(z_2) \\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}\int d^4y_1 d^4z_1 e^{ik_1\cdot y_1}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{ae}(y_1,z_1)\Big(\mathbf{X}^e_A(z_1)\hat{\mathcal{S}}\Big) \\
&\times\int d^4y_2 d^4z_2 e^{ik_2\cdot y_2}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{bf}(y_2,z_2)\Big(\mathbf{K}\pi_{\rm in}\Big)^f(z_2) \\
&-i\hat{\mathcal{S}}\int d^4y_2 d^4z_2 e^{ik_2\cdot y_2}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{bf}(y_2,z_2)\mathbf{K}^{fa}(z_2)
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-i\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4y_2 d^4z_2 e^{ik_2\cdot y_2}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{bf}(y_2,z_2)\Big(\mathbf{X}_A^f(z_2)\hat{\mathcal{S}}\Big)\\
&\times\int d^4y_1 d^4z_1 e^{ik_1\cdot y_1}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{ae}(y_1,z_1)\Big(\mathbf{K}\pi_{\rm in}\Big)^{e}(z_1)\\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4y_2 d^4z_2 e^{ik_2\cdot y_2}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{bf}(y_2,z_2)\\
&\times\int d^4y_1 d^4z_1 e^{ik_1\cdot y_1}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{ae}(y_1,z_1)\ \Big[\mathbf{X}_A^f(z_2)(\nabla^\mu a_\mu)^e(z_1)\Big]\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(z_1)}\\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4y_2 d^4z_2 e^{ik_2\cdot y_2}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{bf}(y_2,z_2)\\
&\times\int d^4y_1 d^4z_1 e^{ik_1\cdot y_1}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{ae}(y_1,z_1)\mathbf{X}_A^f(z_2)\Big(\mathbf{X}_A^e(z_1)\hat{\mathcal{S}}\Big)\\
&+\mathcal{O}(J,a)\ \ , \qquad (136)
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have used $\mathbf{X}_A\mathbf{K}=\mathcal{O}(a)$. We also note that the sixth term of (136) is essentially symmetric since

$$
\Big[\mathbf{X}_A^f(z_2),\mathbf{X}_A^e(z_1)\Big]\hat{\mathcal{S}}=\mathcal{O}(J) \qquad (137)
$$

by (18,53). The fifth term may be reduced by

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4y_1 d^4z_1 e^{ik_1\cdot y_1}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{ae}(y_1,z_1)\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(z_1)}\\
&\times\Big(\nabla^\mu\nabla_\mu\Big)^{ef}(z_1)\int d^4y_2 e^{ik_2\cdot y_2}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{bf}(y_2,z_1)+\mathcal{O}(a)\\
=\quad&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}m_\pi^2\int d^4y_1 d^4z_1 e^{ik_1\cdot y_1}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{ae}(y_1,z_1)\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(z_1)}\\
&\times\int d^4y_2 e^{ik_2\cdot y_2}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{bf}(y_2,z_1)+\mathcal{O}(a,s) \qquad (138)
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have used the fact that $\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}/\delta s(z)$ has no asymptotic component when integrating by parts.

The sixth term gives two components

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4y_2 d^4z_1 e^{ik_2\cdot y_2}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{bf}(y_2,z_1)\nabla_\beta^{fh}(z_1)\\
&\times\int d^4y_1 e^{ik_1\cdot y_1}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{ae}(y_1,z_1)\epsilon^{ehg}\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta v_\beta^g(z_1)} \qquad (139)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4y_2 d^4z_2 e^{ik_2\cdot y_2}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{bf}(y_2,z_2)
$$

$$\times \int d^4y_1 d^4z_1 e^{ik_1\cdot y_1}\Big(1+\mathbf{K}\mathbf{G}_R\Big)^{ae}(y_1,z_1)$$

$$\times\nabla_\beta^{fh}(z_2)\nabla_\alpha^{eg}(z_1)\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a_\alpha^g(z_1)\delta a_\beta^h(z_2)}+\mathcal{O}(a) \tag{140}$$

Applying

$$-i\int d^4y\ e^{-iq\cdot y}\frac{\delta}{\delta v^{\mu c}(y)} \tag{141}$$

the first term in (136) gives no contribution. The second and fourth terms give

$$-\Big[a_{\rm in}^a(k_1),\mathbf{S}\Big]\int d^4y e^{-iq\cdot y}\Big[e^{ik_2\cdot y}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_\mu}-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y_\mu}\Big)\epsilon^{bcf}\pi_{\rm in}^f(y)\Big]+\Big(k_1\ a\leftrightarrow k_2\ b\Big)=$$

$$+i\Big[a_{\rm in}^a(k_1),\mathbf{S}\Big]\Big(2k_{2\mu}-q_\mu\Big)\epsilon^{bcf}\int d^4y e^{+i(k_2-q)\cdot y}\pi_{\rm in}^f(y)+\Big(k_1\ a\leftrightarrow k_2\ b\Big) \tag{142}$$

For photoproduction $q^2=0$ with $q\neq 0$, so that (142) vanishes by energy-momentum conservation. For electroproduction $q^2<0$, we may choose a frame with $q^0=0$ so that k^0-q^0 is positive. Only the annihilation part of $\pi_{\rm in}(y)$ is then picked up, and its contribution vanishes when sandwiched between nucleon states.

The third term gives

$$-\mathbf{S}\int d^4y e^{-iq\cdot y}\Big[e^{ik_2\cdot y}\epsilon^{bca}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_\mu}-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y_\mu}\Big)\ e^{ik_1\cdot y}\Big] \tag{143}$$

which contributes only to the disconnected part.

(138) and (139) give respectively

$$\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}m_\pi^2\int d^4y\ e^{-iq\cdot y}\int d^4z_1\Big[e^{ik_1\cdot y}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu}-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y^\mu}\Big)\epsilon^{ace}\Delta_R(y-z_1)\Big]\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(z_1)}e^{ik_2\cdot z_1}\delta^{be}\\
&+\Big(k_1\ a\leftrightarrow k_2\ b\Big)\\
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}m_\pi^2\int d^4y\ e^{-iq\cdot y}\int d^4z e^{i(k_1+k_2)\cdot z}\delta^{ab}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(z)\delta v^{\mu c}(y)}\\
=\qquad&+\frac{i}{f_\pi}m_\pi^2(2k_{1\mu}-q_\mu)\epsilon^{acb}\frac{1}{(k_1-q)^2-m_\pi^2}\int d^4z e^{i(k_1+k_2-q)\cdot z}\mathbf{S}\hat{\sigma}(z)\\
&+\Big(k_1\ a\leftrightarrow k_2\ b\Big)\\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}m_\pi^2\delta^{ab}\int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq\cdot y+i(k_1+k_2)\cdot z}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}_\mu^c(z)\hat{\sigma}(z)\Big)
\end{aligned} \tag{144}$$

and

$$-\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4y\ e^{-iq\cdot y}\int d^4z\Big[e^{ik_2\cdot y}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu}-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y^\mu}\Big)\epsilon^{bcf}\Delta_R(y-z)\Big]$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\times\frac{\partial}{\partial z_\beta}\Big(e^{ik_1\cdot z}\epsilon^{afg}i\mathbf{S}\mathbf{V}^g_\beta(z)\Big)\\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4y\ e^{i(k_1+k_2-q)\cdot y}\epsilon^{bch}\epsilon^{ahg}i\mathbf{S}\mathbf{V}^g_\mu(y)\\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4y\ e^{-iq\cdot y}\int d^4z e^{ik_2\cdot z}\\
&\times\frac{\partial}{\partial z_\beta}\Big(\Big[e^{ik_1\cdot y}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu}-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y^\mu}\Big)\Delta_R(y-z)\Big]\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{beg}i\mathbf{S}\mathbf{V}^g_\beta(z)\Big)\\
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4y\ e^{-iq\cdot y}\int d^4z e^{ik_2\cdot z}\\
&\times\frac{\partial}{\partial z_\beta}\Big[e^{ik_1\cdot z}\epsilon^{abg}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^g_\beta(z)\Big)\Big]\\
=\quad&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}(2k_{2\mu}-q_\mu)k_1^\beta\epsilon^{bcf}\epsilon^{afg}\frac{1}{(k_2-q)^2-m_\pi^2}\int d^4z e^{i(k_1+k_2-q)\cdot z}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{V}^g_\beta(z)\\
&+\Big(k_1\ a\leftrightarrow k_2\ b\Big)\\
&-\frac{1}{2f_\pi^2}(k_1^\beta-k_2^\beta)\epsilon^{abg}\int d^4yd^4z e^{-iq\cdot y+(k_1+k_2)\cdot z}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^g_\beta(z)\Big)
\end{aligned}
\tag{145}
$$

where we have used the Ward identity

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial z_\beta}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^g_\beta(z)\Big)=i\epsilon^{gce}\delta^4(z-y)\,\mathbf{S}\mathbf{V}^e_\mu(z)\ \ . \tag{146}
$$

(140) gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4y\ e^{-iq\cdot y}\int d^4z_2\Big[e^{ik_2\cdot y}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu}-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y^\mu}\Big)\epsilon^{bcf}\Delta_R(y-z_2)\Big]\\
&\times\int d^4z_1e^{ik_1\cdot z_1}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{1\alpha}}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{2\beta}}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^f_{A\beta}(z_2)\Big)\\
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4y\ e^{-iq\cdot y}\int d^4z_1e^{ik_1\cdot z_1+ik_2\cdot y}\epsilon^{bch}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{1\alpha}}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^h_{A\mu}(y)\Big)\\
&+\Big(k_1\ a\leftrightarrow k_2\ b\Big)\\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4y\ e^{-iq\cdot y}\int d^4z_2e^{ik_2\cdot z_2}\int d^4z_1e^{ik_1\cdot z_1}\\
&\times\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{1\alpha}}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{2\beta}}i^3\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\Big)\\
=\quad&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}(2k_{2\mu}-q_\mu)k_{1\alpha}(k_1^\beta-q^\beta)\epsilon^{bcf}\frac{1}{(k_2-q)^2-m_\pi^2}\\
&\times\int d^4z_1d^4z_2e^{ik_1\cdot z_1+i(k_2-q)\cdot z_2}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^f_{A\beta}(z_2)\Big)\\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_1^\alpha\epsilon^{bch}\int d^4yd^4z_1e^{i(k_2-q)\cdot y+ik_1\cdot z_1}\ \mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^h_{A\mu}(y)\Big)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\Big(k_1\ a \leftrightarrow k_2\ b\Big)\\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_1^\alpha k_2^\beta \int d^4y d^4z_1 d^4z_2 e^{-iq\cdot y+ik_1\cdot z_1+ik_2\cdot z_2}\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\Big) \qquad (147)
\end{aligned}
$$

To lowest order in the momentum, the above results yield for the isovector part of the two-pion photo- and electro-production amplitude

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int d^4y e^{-iq\cdot y} < N(p_2)|a^a_{\rm in}(k_1)a^b_{\rm in}(k_2)\mathbf{S}\mathbf{V}^a_\mu(y)|N(p_1) >_{\rm conn.}=\\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}(2k_{2\mu}-q_\mu)k_1^\beta\epsilon^{bcf}\epsilon^{afg}\frac{1}{(k_2-q)^2-m_\pi^2}\int d^4z e^{i(k_1+k_2-q)\cdot z} < N(p_2)|\mathbf{V}^g_\beta(z)|N(p_1) >\\
&+\frac{1}{2f_\pi^2}\epsilon^{bch}\epsilon^{ahg}\int d^4z e^{i(k_1+k_2-q)\cdot z} < N(p_2)|\mathbf{V}^g_\mu(z)|N(p_1) > +\Big(k_1\ a \leftrightarrow k_2\ b\Big)\\
&-\frac{1}{2f_\pi^2}(k_1^\beta-k_2^\beta)\epsilon^{abg}\int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq\cdot y+i(k_1+k_2)\cdot z} < N(p_2)|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^g_\beta(z)\Big)|N(p_1) > (148)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last term is necessary to maintain current conservation. Fig. 3 illustrates the various contributions to (148). As before, the result applies to the isospin 3/2 channel where the isoscalar part of the current does not contribute. Our result is in agreement with part of the original result derived by Carruthers and Huang [34] in the soft pion limit.

Since the isovector part of the electromagnetic current is G-parity even, the anomalous process $\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0\pi^-$ as a t-channel pole is absent from (148). The anomalous process is expected in the isospin 1/2 channel through the isoscalar part of the electromagnetic current. The latter requires a full $SU(3)\times SU(3)$ analysis. The extraction of the $\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0\pi^-$ amplitude from the $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi\pi N$ reaction, provide an alternative to the conventional collider experiments using $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^+\pi^-$.

In the threshold region, the reaction $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi\pi N$ has been studied in the isobar regime with a particular emphasis on $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi\Delta \rightarrow \pi\pi N$ [35]. Since our formulation does not account for baryon dynamics, our results would not be accurate in the resonance region. However, since the isobar excitation energy is about $M_\Delta - M - 2m_\pi \sim 14$ MeV, it would be interesting to see how our results compare with the data within this energy range, although the width of the isobar and the nearness of the $N^*(1520)$ may cause some problems.

Finally, we note that a set of interesting and new experiments by the MAMI collaboration are presently being carried out at MAINZ, for two-pion photoproduction on proton targets, measuring directly $\gamma p \to \pi^+\pi^- p$, $\gamma p \to \pi^0\pi^0$ and $\gamma^* p \to \pi^+\pi^0 n$. Also the reaction $\gamma p \to \pi^+\pi^0 n$ will be measured at CEBAF using tagged photons with special emphasis on the extraction of $\gamma\pi \to \pi\pi^0$ from the t-channel pole. In light of this and the more recent calculations in the context of heavy-baryon chiral perturbation theory [36, 37], it would be interesting to extend the present analysis to baryon dynamics beyond threshold.

12. Radiative Pion-Nucleon Scattering : $\pi N \to \pi\gamma N$

The radiative pion-nucleon transition amplitude involves the isovector current in the form

$$\begin{aligned}
&+\epsilon^\mu(q)\int d^4y e^{iq\cdot y} < N(p_2)|a^b_{\rm in}(k_2)\mathbf{S}\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)a^{a\dagger}_{\rm in}(k_1)|N(p_1)> = \\
&-i\epsilon^\mu(q)\int d^4y e^{iq\cdot y} < N(p_2)|\frac{\delta}{\delta v^{\mu c}(y)}\Big[\Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2), \hat{\mathcal{S}}, a^{a\dagger}_{\rm in}(k_1)\Big]\Big]|N(p_1)> \qquad (149)
\end{aligned}$$

This amplitude follows from $\gamma N \to \pi\pi N$ by crossing $k_1, q \to -k_1, -q$. The result is the sum of three terms

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{2i}{f_\pi}m_\pi^2\epsilon(q)\cdot k_1\epsilon^{acb}\frac{1}{(k_1-q)^2-m_\pi^2} \\
&\times\int d^4z e^{i(-k_1+k_2+q)\cdot z} < N(p_2)|\hat{\sigma}(z)|N(p_1)> \\
&+\Big(-k_1\ a \leftrightarrow k_2\ b\Big) \\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}m_\pi^2\epsilon^\mu(q)\delta^{ab}\int d^4y d^4z e^{iq\cdot y+i(-k_1+k_2)\cdot z} < N(p_2)|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\hat{\sigma}(z)\Big)|N(p_1)> \qquad (150)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{2}{f_\pi^2}\epsilon(q)\cdot k_2 k_1^\beta\epsilon^{bcf}\epsilon^{afg}\frac{1}{(k_2+q)^2-m_\pi^2}\int d^4z e^{i(-k_1+k_2+q)\cdot z} < N(p_2)|\mathbf{V}^g_\beta(z)|N(p_1)> \\
&+\frac{1}{2f_\pi^2}\epsilon^\mu(q)\epsilon^{bch}\epsilon^{ahg}\int d^4z e^{i(-k_1+k_2+q)\cdot z} < N(p_2)|\mathbf{V}^g_\mu(z)|N(p_1)> + \Big(-k_1\ a \leftrightarrow k_2\ b\Big) \\
&+\frac{1}{2f_\pi^2}\epsilon^\mu(q)(k_1^\beta+k_2^\beta)\epsilon^{abg}\int d^4y d^4z e^{+iq\cdot y+i(-k_1+k_2)\cdot z} < N(p_2)|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^g_\beta(z)\Big)|N(p_1)> \\
&\qquad (151)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{2}{f_\pi^2}\epsilon(q)\cdot k_2 k_1^\alpha(k_1^\beta-q^\beta)\frac{1}{(k_2+q)^2-m_\pi^2}\epsilon^{bcf} \\
&\times\int d^4z_1 d^4z_2 e^{-ik_1\cdot z_1+i(k_2+q)\cdot z_2} < N(p_2)|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^f_{A\beta}(z_2)\Big)|N(p_1)> \\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\epsilon^\mu(q)\epsilon^{bch}\int d^4y d^4z_1 e^{-ik_1\cdot z_1+i(k_2+q)\cdot y} < N(p_2)|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^h_{A\mu}(y)\Big)|N(p_1)>
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\Big(-k_1\ \ a \leftrightarrow k_2\ \ b\Big)\\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_1^\alpha k_2^\beta \epsilon^\mu(q)\int d^4y d^4z_1 d^4z_2 e^{+iq\cdot y-ik_1\cdot z_1+ik_2\cdot z_2}\\
&\quad\times < N(p_2)|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\Big)|N(p_1)>
\end{aligned}
\tag{152}
$$

The low momentum result is given by (151), and illustrated in Fig. 4.

Radiative pion-nucleus scattering $\pi^- A \to \pi^-\gamma A$ has been studied experimentally at Serpukhov [38], using 40 GeV pions with final $\pi^-\gamma$ detected in coincidence. In the kinematical regime $t \sim 0$ the pion scatters off a virtual photon in the Coulomb field of a fixed nucleus A. The reaction is of the Primakoff type and is equivalent to $\gamma\pi^- \to \gamma\pi^-$ on a fixed π^- target, with γ's in the $60-600$ MeV range. This experiment was used to determine the pion electric polarizability as we will discuss below. Here we would like to note that since we are treating the electromagnetic interaction to first order in the electric charge, the Primakoff term is absent from our result (152). The inclusion of electromagnetic effects beyond leading order requires the $U(1)$ gauging of (7-8), and a rerun of the above arguments. This point will be discussed elsewhere.

13. Pion-Pion Scattering : $\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$

We now proceed to the $\pi\pi$-scattering amplitude.

$$
\begin{aligned}
&< 0|a^d_{\rm in}(p_2)a^b_{\rm in}(k_2)\Big(\mathbf{S}-\mathbf{1}\Big)a^{a\dagger}_{\rm in}(k_1)a^{c\dagger}_{\rm in}(p_1)|0>\\
=\quad &< 0|\Big[a^d_{\rm in}(p_2),\Big[\Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2),\Big[\mathbf{S},a^{a\dagger}_{\rm in}(k_1)\Big]\Big],a^{c\dagger}_{\rm in}(p_1)\Big]\Big]|0>\\
=\quad &(2\pi)^4\delta^4(k_1+p_1-k_2-p_2)i\mathcal{T}\Big(p_2d,k_2b\leftarrow k_1a,p_1c\Big).
\end{aligned}
\tag{153}
$$

Here we have used the stability of the vacuum and one-particle states, and anticipated energy and momentum conservation.

13.1. Reduction

For the triple commutator

$$
\Big[\Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2),\Big[\mathbf{S},a^{a\dagger}_{\rm in}(k_1)\Big]\Big],a^{c\dagger}_{\rm in}(p_1)\Big]
\tag{154}
$$

we need to evaluate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\delta}{\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)}\frac{\delta}{\delta a^b_\beta(y_2)}\Big[\hat{\mathcal{S}}, a^{c\dagger}_{\rm in}(p_1)\Big] = \\
&+i\mathbf{S}e^{-ip_1\cdot y_1}\Big(\epsilon^{cae}\epsilon^{ebf}+\epsilon^{cbe}\epsilon^{eaf}\Big)\delta^4(y_1-y_2)g^{\alpha\beta}\pi^f(y_1) \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{-ip_1\cdot y_1}\delta^{ac}(\partial_1^\alpha - ip_1^\alpha)\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(y_1)\delta a^b_\beta(y_2)} + \frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{-ip_1\cdot y_2}\delta^{bc}(\partial_2^\beta - ip_2^\beta)\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(y_1)\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)} \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{-ip_1\cdot y_1}\epsilon^{cae}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta v^e_\alpha(y_1)\delta a^b_\beta(y_2)} + \frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{-ip_1\cdot y_2}\epsilon^{cbe}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta v^e_\beta(y_2)\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)} \\
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi}p_{1\gamma}\int d^4y_3 e^{-ip_1\cdot y_3}\frac{\delta^3\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)\delta a^b_\beta(y_2)\delta a^c_\gamma(y_3)}. \qquad (155)
\end{aligned}$$

Hence (154) consists of the following five terms

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}m_\pi^2\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y}\delta^{ab}\Big[\mathbf{S}\hat{\sigma}(y), a^{c\dagger}_{\rm in}(p_1)\Big] \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_1^\alpha\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y}\epsilon^{abe}\Big[\mathbf{S}\mathbf{V}^e_\alpha(y), a^{c\dagger}_{\rm in}(p_1)\Big] \qquad (156)
\end{aligned}$$

$$+\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}\mathbf{S}k_1\cdot k_2\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2+p_1)\cdot y}\Big(\epsilon^{cae}\epsilon^{ebf}+\epsilon^{cbe}\epsilon^{eaf}\Big)\pi^f(y) \qquad (157)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi^3}m_\pi^2 k_{2\beta}\delta^{ac}\int d^4y_1 d^4y_2 e^{-i(k_1+p_1)\cdot y_1 + ik_2\cdot y_2}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(y_1)\delta a^b_\beta(y_2)} \\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi^3}m_\pi^2 k_{1\alpha}\delta^{bc}\int d^4y_1 d^4y_2 e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1 + i(k_2-p_1)\cdot y_2}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(y_2)\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)} \qquad (158)
\end{aligned}$$

$$+\frac{i}{f_\pi^3}k_{1\alpha}k_{2\beta}p_{1\gamma}\int d^4y_1 d^4y_2 d^4y_3 e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1 + ik_2\cdot y_2 - ip_1\cdot y_3}\frac{\delta^3\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)\delta a^b_\beta(y_2)\delta a^c_\gamma(y_3)} \qquad (159)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^3}k_{1\alpha}k_{2\beta}\epsilon^{cae}\int d^4y_1 d^4y_2 e^{-i(k_1+p_1)\cdot y_1 + ik_2\cdot y_2}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta v^e_\alpha(y_1)\delta a^b_\beta(y_2)} \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^3}k_{1\alpha}k_{2\beta}\epsilon^{cbe}\int d^4y_1 d^4y_2 e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1 + i(k_2-p_1)\cdot y_2}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)\delta v^e_\beta(y_2)}. \qquad (160)
\end{aligned}$$

To obtain a more symmetric representation, we note that

$$\Big[\mathbf{S}\hat{\sigma}(y), a^{a\dagger}_{\rm in}(k_1)\Big] = -\frac{i}{f_\pi}\frac{\delta}{\delta s(y)}\Big[\hat{\mathcal{S}}, a^{a\dagger}_{\rm in}(k_1)\Big] =$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi}\mathbf{S}e^{-ik_1\cdot y}\pi^a_{\rm in}(y)-\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}e^{-ik_1\cdot y}\int d^4z\Delta_R(y-z)\partial_\beta\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^a_\beta(z)}\\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4y_1e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_1^\alpha}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)\delta s(y)}=\\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi}\mathbf{S}e^{-ik_1\cdot y}\pi^a(y)+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_{1\alpha}\int d^4y_1e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)\delta s(y)}
\end{aligned}\tag{161}$$

Similarly

$$\Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2),\mathbf{S}\hat{\sigma}(y)\Big]=-\frac{1}{f_\pi}\mathbf{S}e^{ik_2\cdot y}\pi^b(y)-\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_{2\beta}\int d^4y_2e^{ik_2\cdot y_1}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^b_\beta(y_2)\delta s(y)}\tag{162}$$

Hence (158) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}m_\pi^2\delta^{bc}\int d^4ye^{i(k_2-p_1)\cdot y}\Big[\mathbf{S}\hat{\sigma}(y),a^{a\dagger}_{\rm in}(k_1)\Big]\\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}m_\pi^2\delta^{bc}\int d^4ye^{i(k_2-p_1-k_1)\cdot y}\mathbf{S}\pi^a(y)\\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}m_\pi^2\delta^{ac}\int d^4ye^{-i(k_1+p_1)\cdot y}\Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2),\mathbf{S}\hat{\sigma}(y)\Big]\\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}m_\pi^2\delta^{ac}\int d^4ye^{-i(k_1-k_2+p_1)\cdot y}\mathbf{S}\pi^b(y)
\end{aligned}\tag{163}$$

In the same manner we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big[\mathbf{S}\mathbf{V}^{\gamma e}(y),a^{a\dagger}_{\rm in}(k_1)\Big]=-i\frac{\delta}{\delta v^e_\gamma(y)}\Big[\hat{\mathcal{S}},a^{a\dagger}_{\rm in}(k_1)\Big]=\\
&-\mathbf{S}e^{-ik_1\cdot y}\epsilon^{aef}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_\gamma}-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y_\gamma}\Big)\pi^f_{\rm in}(y)\\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}e^{-ik_1\cdot y}\epsilon^{aef}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_\gamma}-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y_\gamma}\Big)\int d^4z\Delta_R(y-z)\partial_\mu\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^f_\mu(z)}\\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}e^{-ik_1\cdot y}\epsilon^{aef}\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^f_\gamma(y)}\\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}\int d^4y_1e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_1^\alpha}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)\delta v^e_\gamma(y)}\\
&=-ik_1^\gamma e^{-ik_1\cdot y}\epsilon^{aef}\mathbf{S}\pi^f(y)+\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{-ik_1\cdot y}\epsilon^{aef}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}^{\gamma f}(y)\\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi}k_{1\alpha}\int d^4y_1e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)\delta v^e_\gamma(y)}
\end{aligned}\tag{164}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2),\mathbf{S}\mathbf{V}^{\gamma e}(y)\Big]=ik_2^\gamma e^{ik_2\cdot y}\epsilon^{bef}\mathbf{S}\pi^f(y)\\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{ik_2\cdot y}\epsilon^{bef}\mathbf{S}A^{\gamma f}(y)-\frac{1}{f_\pi}k_{2\beta}\int d^4y_2e^{ik_2\cdot y_2}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^b_\beta(y_2)\delta v^e_\gamma(y)}.
\end{aligned}\tag{165}$$

Thus, (160) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_{2\beta}\epsilon^{cbe}\int d^4y e^{i(k_2-p_1)\cdot y}\Big[\mathbf{SV}^e_\beta(y), a^{a\dagger}_{\rm in}(k_1)\Big] \\
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}k_1\cdot k_2\epsilon^{cbe}\epsilon^{aef}\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2+p_1)\cdot y}\mathbf{S}\pi^f(y) \\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi^3}k_{2\beta}\epsilon^{cbe}\epsilon^{aef}\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2+p_1)\cdot y}\mathbf{SA}^f_\beta(y) \\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_{1\alpha}\epsilon^{cae}\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1+p_1)\cdot y}\Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2), \mathbf{SV}^e_\alpha(y)\Big] \\
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}k_1\cdot k_2\epsilon^{cae}\epsilon^{bef}\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2+p_1)\cdot y}\mathbf{S}\pi^f(y) \\
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi^3}k_{1\alpha}\epsilon^{cae}\epsilon^{bef}\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2+p_1)\cdot y}\mathbf{SA}^f_\alpha(y).
\end{aligned}\tag{166}$$

The pion piece in (166) cancels against (157) to give the following result for the triple commutator (154)

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}m_\pi^2\delta^{ab}\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y}\Big[\mathbf{S}\hat\sigma(y), a^{c\dagger}_{\rm in}(p_1)\Big] + 2\text{ perm.} \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_1^\alpha\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y}\epsilon^{abe}\Big[\mathbf{SV}^e_\alpha(y), a^{c\dagger}_{\rm in}(p_1)\Big] + 2\text{ perm.} \\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}m_\pi^2\delta^{ac}\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2+p_1)\cdot y}\mathbf{S}\pi^b(y) - \frac{i}{f_\pi^2}m_\pi^2\delta^{bc}\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2+p_1)\cdot y}\mathbf{S}\pi^a(y) \\
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi^3}k_{1\alpha}k_{2\beta}p_{1\gamma}\int d^4y_1d^4y_2d^4y_3 e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1+ik_2\cdot y_2-ip_1\cdot y_3}\frac{\delta^3\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)\delta a^b_\beta(y_2)\delta a^c_\gamma(y_3)} \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^3}k_1^\alpha\epsilon^{cae}\epsilon^{bef}\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2+p_1)\cdot y}\mathbf{SA}^f_\alpha(y) \\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^3}k_2^\beta\epsilon^{cbe}\epsilon^{aef}\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2+p_1)\cdot y}\mathbf{SA}^f_\beta(y).
\end{aligned}\tag{167}$$

It is now easy to see that the amplitude is symmetric under permutations $(a\ k_1)$, $(b\ (-k_2))$ and $(c\ p_1)$. We remark that most of the expressions derived above are quoted to leading order in the external fields.

13.2. Weinberg Result

To relate the various terms of the amplitude to physical observables, we introduce the pion scalar form factor

$$< 0|a^d_{\rm in}(p_2)\Big[\mathbf{S}\hat\sigma(y), a^{c\dagger}_{\rm in}(p_1)\Big]|0 >= \delta^{cd}\mathbf{F}_S(t)e^{-i(p_1-p_2)\cdot y}\tag{168}$$

and the pion electromagnetic form factor

$$< 0|a^d_{\rm in}(p_2)\Big[\mathbf{SV}^e_\alpha(y), a^{c\dagger}_{\rm in}(p_1)\Big]|0 >= i\epsilon^{dec}(p_1+p_2)_\alpha\mathbf{F}_V(t)e^{-i(p_1-p_2)\cdot y}\tag{169}$$

as well as the Mandelstam variables

$$\begin{aligned} s &= (k_1 + p_1)^2 = (k_2 + p_2)^2 \\ t &= (k_1 - k_2)^2 = (p_1 - p_2)^2 \\ u &= (k_1 - p_2)^2 = (p_1 - k_2)^2. \end{aligned} \tag{170}$$

Inserting (167) into (153), we find that $i\mathcal{T}$ is a sum of

$$-\frac{i}{f_\pi} m_\pi^2 \delta^{ab}\delta^{cd} \mathbf{F}_S(t) + \frac{i}{2f_\pi^2}(s-u)\mathbf{F}_V(t)\epsilon^{abe}\epsilon^{cde} - \frac{i}{2f_\pi^2} t\delta^{ab}\delta^{cd} + 2 \text{ perm} \tag{171}$$

and

$$\frac{i}{f_\pi^3} k_{1\alpha}k_{2\beta}p_{1\gamma} \int d^4y_1 d^4y_2 d^4y_3 e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1 + ik_2\cdot y_2 - ip_1\cdot y_3} < 0|\Big[a_{\rm in}^d(p_2), \frac{\delta^3\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a_\alpha^a(y_1)\delta a_\beta^b(y_2)\delta a_\gamma^c(y_3)}\Big]|0> \tag{172}$$

modulo $(2\pi)^4\delta(k_1 + p_1 - k_2 - p_2)$.

As a check on (171-172) we may evaluate $i\mathcal{T}$ at tree level $\mathcal{O}(1/f_\pi^2)$. In this case, (172) does not contribute, $\mathbf{F}_S \rightarrow -1/f_\pi$ from (161), and $\mathbf{F}_V \rightarrow \mathbf{F}_V(0) = 1$ by charge normalization. Thus

$$i\mathcal{T}_{\rm tree} = \frac{i}{f_\pi^2}(t - m_\pi^2)\delta^{ab}\delta^{cd} + \frac{i}{f_\pi^2}(s - m_\pi^2)\delta^{ac}\delta^{bd} + \frac{i}{f_\pi^2}(u - m_\pi^2)\delta^{ad}\delta^{bc}. \tag{173}$$

which is Weinberg's standard result.

13.3. General Result

Having checked this, we return to the general result. For that, we need to evaluate

$$\frac{\delta^3}{\delta a_\alpha^a(y_1)\delta a_\beta^b(y_2)\delta a_\gamma^c(y_3)}\Big[a_{\rm in}^d(p_2), \hat{\mathcal{S}}\Big] \tag{174}$$

This functional derivative consists of six terms

$$\begin{aligned} &-\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{ip_2\cdot y_1}\Big(\epsilon^{dae}\epsilon^{ebc} + \epsilon^{dbe}\epsilon^{eac}\Big)(-g^{\alpha\beta})\delta^4(y_1 - y_2) \\ &\times\Delta_R(y_1 - y_3)\Big(-\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{3\gamma}} - \frac{\overset{\leftarrow}{\partial}}{\partial y_{3\gamma}}\Big)\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(y_3)} + \ 2 \text{ perm.} \end{aligned} \tag{175}$$

$$-\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{ip_2\cdot y_3}\delta^{cd}\Big(-\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{3\gamma}} - \frac{\overset{\leftarrow}{\partial}}{\partial y_{3\gamma}}\Big)\frac{\delta^3\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(y_3)\delta a_\alpha^a(y_1)\delta a_\beta^b(y_2)} + \ 2 \text{ perm.} \tag{176}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{ip_2\cdot y_1}\Big(\epsilon^{dae}\epsilon^{ebf}+\epsilon^{dbe}\epsilon^{eaf}\Big)(-g^{\alpha\beta})\delta^4(y_1-y_2)\\
&\times\int d^4z\Delta_R(y_1-z)\frac{\partial}{\partial z^\mu}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^f_\mu(z)\delta a^c_\gamma(y_3)}+2\text{ perm.}
\end{aligned}
\tag{177}
$$

$$
+\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{ip_2\cdot y_1}\Big(\epsilon^{dae}\epsilon^{ebf}+\epsilon^{dbe}\epsilon^{eaf}\Big)(-g^{\alpha\beta})\delta^4(y_1-y_2)\Delta_R(y_1-y_3)\epsilon^{fcg}\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta v^g_\gamma(y_3)}+\ 2\text{ perm.}
\tag{178}
$$

$$
+\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4y e^{ip_2\cdot y}\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu}\frac{\delta^4\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^d_\mu(y)\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)\delta a^b_\beta(y_2)\delta a^c_\gamma(y_3)}
\tag{179}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{ip_2\cdot y_3}\epsilon^{edc}\frac{\delta^3\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta v^e_\gamma(y_3)\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)\delta a^b_\beta(y_2)}+\ 2\text{ perm.}\\
&-\Big(\epsilon^{daf}\epsilon^{fbe}+\epsilon^{dbf}\epsilon^{fae}\Big)\delta^4(y_1-y_2)\,e^{ip_2\cdot y_1}\,g^{\alpha\beta}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{j}^{\gamma\,c}_A(y_3)\pi^e_{\rm in}(y_1)+\ 2\text{ perm.}
\end{aligned}
\tag{180}
$$

Applying

$$
\frac{i}{f_\pi^3}k_{1\alpha}k_{2\beta}p_{1\gamma}\int d^4y_1d^4y_2d^4y_3e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1+ik_2\cdot y_2-ip_1\cdot y_3}
\tag{181}
$$

and using (111), we find that (175, 177, 178) sum up to

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi^3}k_1\cdot k_2\int d^4y_1d^4z e^{-i(k_1-k_2-p_2)\cdot y_1}\Big(\epsilon^{dae}\epsilon^{ebf}+\epsilon^{dbe}\epsilon^{eaf}\Big)\Delta_R(y_1-z)\partial^\mu\Big[\mathbf{S}\mathbf{j}^f_{A\mu}(z),a^{c\dagger}_{\rm in}(p_1)\Big]\\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}k_1\cdot k_2\int d^4y_1e^{-i(k_1-k_2-p_2+p_1)\cdot y_1}\Big(\epsilon^{dae}\epsilon^{ebc}+\epsilon^{dbe}\epsilon^{eac}\Big)\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(y_1)}+\ 2\text{ perm.}
\end{aligned}
\tag{182}
$$

Hence the contribution to $i\mathcal{T}$ is

$$
-\frac{i}{f_\pi^3}k_1\cdot k_2\Big(\epsilon^{dae}\epsilon^{ebc}+\epsilon^{dbe}\epsilon^{eac}\Big)<0|\hat{\sigma}|0>+\ 2\text{ perm}
\tag{183}
$$

The contribution to $i\mathcal{T}$ from (176) is

$$
+\frac{i}{f_\pi^3}m_\pi^2k_1^\alpha k_2^\beta\delta^{cd}\int d^4y_1d^4y_2e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1+ik_2\cdot y_2}<0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(y_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y_2)\hat{\sigma}(0)\Big)|0>+2\text{ perm}
\tag{184}
$$

whereas the contribution from (179) is

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}k_1^\alpha k_2^\beta p_1^\gamma p_2^\delta\int d^4y_1d^4y_2d^4y_3e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1+ik_2\cdot y_2-ip_1\cdot y_3}\\
&\times<0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(y_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y_2)\mathbf{j}^c_{A\gamma}(y_3)\mathbf{j}^d_{A\delta}(0)\Big)|0>\,.
\end{aligned}
\tag{185}
$$

We observe that the disconnected pieces in (184-185)

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi^3} m_\pi^2 k_1^\alpha k_2^\beta \delta^{cd} \int d^4y_1 d^4y_2 e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1+ik_2\cdot y_2} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(y_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y_2)\Big)|0 >< 0|\hat{\sigma}|0 > \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^4} k_1^\alpha k_2^\beta p_1^\gamma p_2^\delta \int d^4y_1 d^4y_2 d^4y_3 e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1+ik_2\cdot y_2-ip_1\cdot y_3} \\
&\times < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(y_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y_2)\Big)|0 >< 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^c_{A\gamma}(y_3)\mathbf{j}^d_{A\delta}(0)\Big)|0 > + 2 \text{ perm} \qquad (186)
\end{aligned}
$$

cancel out by (112-113).

As for (180) it is convenient to relate it back to the electromagnetic form factor (169). From (164) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2), \Big[\mathbf{S}\mathbf{V}^{\gamma e}(y), a^{a\dagger}_{\rm in}(k_1)\Big]\Big] = \\
&-ik_1^\gamma e^{-ik_1\cdot y}\epsilon^{aef}\Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2), \mathbf{S}\pi^f(y)\Big] \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi} e^{-ik_1\cdot y}\epsilon^{aef}\Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2), \mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}^{\gamma f}(y)\Big] \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi} k_{1\alpha}\int d^4y_1 e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1}\Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2), \frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)\delta v^e_\gamma(y)}\Big]. \qquad (187)
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence we need,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\delta^2}{\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)\delta v^e_\gamma(y)}\Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2), \hat{\mathcal{S}}\Big] = \\
&+e^{ik_2\cdot y}\epsilon^{bef}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{j}^{\alpha\, a}_A(y_1)\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_\gamma} - ik_2^\gamma\Big)\pi^f_{\rm in}(y) \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi} e^{ik_2\cdot y}\epsilon^{bea}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_\gamma} - ik_2^\gamma\Big)\Delta_R(y-y_1)\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{1\alpha}} + \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y_{1\alpha}}\Big)\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(y_1)} \\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi} e^{ik_2\cdot y}\epsilon^{bea} g^{\alpha\gamma}\delta^4(y-y_1)\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(y_1)} \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi} e^{ik_2\cdot y_1}\delta^{ab}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{1\alpha}} + ik_2^\alpha\Big)\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(y_1)\delta v^e_\gamma(y)} \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi} e^{ik_2\cdot y}\epsilon^{bef}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_\gamma} - ik_2^\gamma\Big)\int d^4z \Delta_R(y-z)\frac{\partial}{\partial z^\mu}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^f_\mu(z)\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)} \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi} e^{ik_2\cdot y}\epsilon^{bef}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_\gamma} - ik_2^\gamma\Big)\Delta_R(y-y_1)\epsilon^{fag}\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta v^g_\alpha(y_1)} \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi} e^{ik_2\cdot y}\epsilon^{bef}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^f_\gamma(y)\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)} \\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi} k_{2\beta}\int d^4y_2 e^{ik_2\cdot y_2}\frac{\delta^3\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)\delta a^b_\beta(y_2)\delta v^e_\gamma(y)}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$+\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{ik_2\cdot y_1}\epsilon^{baf}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta v^f_\alpha(y_1)\delta v^e_\gamma(y)}. \tag{188}$$

Substituting this back into (187) and using (111), we find that (187) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
&-ik_1^\gamma e^{-ik_1\cdot y}\epsilon^{aef}\Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2),\mathbf{S}\pi^f(y)\Big]\\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{-ik_1\cdot y}\epsilon^{aef}\Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2),\mathbf{S}\mathbf{A}^{\gamma f}(y)\Big]\\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi}\epsilon^{bef}e^{ik_2\cdot y}k_{1\alpha}\int d^4y_1e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{j}^{\alpha a}_A(y_1)\Big(\frac{\partial}{y_\gamma}-ik_2^\gamma\Big)\pi^f_{\rm in}(y)\\
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}m_\pi^2\delta^{ab}\int d^4y_1e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y_1}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(y_1)\delta v^e_\gamma(y)}\\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{ik_2\cdot y}\epsilon^{bef}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_\gamma}-ik_2^\gamma\Big)\int d^4z\Delta_R(y-z)\partial^\mu\Big[\mathbf{S}\mathbf{j}^f_{A\mu}(z),a^{a\dagger}_{\rm in}(k_1)\Big]\\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y}\epsilon^{bea}(k_1+k_2)^\gamma\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(y)}\\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{ik_2\cdot y}\epsilon^{bef}\Big[\mathbf{S}\mathbf{j}^{\gamma f}_A(y),a^{a\dagger}_{\rm in}(k_1)\Big]\\
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y}\epsilon^{bef}\epsilon^{afg}\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta v^g_\gamma(y)}\\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}k_{1\alpha}k_{2\beta}\int d^4y_1d^4y_2e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1+ik_2\cdot y_2}\frac{\delta^3\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)\delta a^b_\beta(y_2)\delta v^e_\gamma(y)}\\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_{1\alpha}\epsilon^{baf}\int d^4y_1e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y_1}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta v^f_\alpha(y_1)\delta v^e_\gamma(y)}.
\end{aligned}\tag{189}$$

Taking the vacuum expectation value gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&+i\epsilon^{bea}(k_1+k_2)_\gamma\mathbf{F}_V(t)e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y}=\\
&+i\epsilon^{bea}(k_1+k_2)_\gamma e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y}-\frac{i}{f_\pi}e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y}\epsilon^{bea}(k_1+k_2)_\gamma<0|\hat{\sigma}|0>\\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_1^\alpha k_2^\beta\int d^4y_1d^4y_2e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1+ik_2\cdot y_2}<0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(y_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y_2)\mathbf{V}^e_\gamma(y)\Big)|0>\\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\epsilon^{baf}k_1^\alpha\int d^4y_1e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y_1}<0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^f_\alpha(y_1)\mathbf{V}^e_\gamma(y)\Big)|0>.
\end{aligned}\tag{190}$$

Introducing the vector correlation function

$$\int d^4xe^{iq\cdot x}<0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^a_\alpha(x)\mathbf{V}^b_\beta(0)\Big)|0>=-i\delta^{ab}\Big(-g_{\alpha\beta}q^2+q_\alpha q_\beta\Big)\mathbf{\Pi}_V(q^2) \tag{191}$$

we find that the contribution of (180) to $i\mathcal{T}$ is

$$\frac{i}{2f_\pi^2}\epsilon^{abe}\epsilon^{cde}(s-u)\Big(\mathbf{F}_V(t)-1+\frac{1}{f_\pi}<0|\hat{\sigma}|0>-\frac{1}{2f_\pi^2}t\mathbf{\Pi}_V(t)\Big)+2\text{ perm} \tag{192}$$

Collecting all the terms (171, 183, 184, 185, 192), we find the desired result for the $\pi\pi$ scattering amplitude

$$\begin{aligned}
&i\mathcal{T}\Big(p_2 d, k_2 b \leftarrow k_1 a, p_1 c\Big) = -\frac{i}{f_\pi} m_\pi^2 \delta^{ab}\delta^{cd}\mathbf{F}_S(t) - \frac{i}{2f_\pi^2} t\delta^{ab}\delta^{cd} + 2\text{ perm.}\\
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}\epsilon^{abe}\epsilon^{cde}(s-u)\Big(\mathbf{F}_V(t) - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4f_\pi^2} t\mathbf{\Pi}_V(t)\Big) + 2\text{ perm.}\\
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi^3} m_\pi^2 k_1^\alpha k_2^\beta \delta^{cd}\int d^4y_1 d^4y_2 e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1 + ik_2\cdot y_2} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(y_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y_2)\hat{\sigma}(0)\Big)|0>_{\text{conn}} +2\text{ perm}\\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^4} k_1^\alpha k_2^\beta p_1^\gamma p_2^\delta \int d^4y_1 d^4y_2 d^4y_3 e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1 + ik_2\cdot y_2 - ip_1\cdot y_3}\\
&\times < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(y_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y_2)\mathbf{j}^c_{A\gamma}(y_3)\mathbf{j}^d_{A\delta}(0)\Big)|0>_{\text{conn}}\ .
\end{aligned} \tag{193}$$

In the chiral limit, this result reduces to

$$\begin{aligned}
&i\mathcal{T}\Big(p_2 d, k_2 b \leftarrow k_1 a, p_1 c\Big) = +\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}\epsilon^{abe}\epsilon^{cde}(s-u)\Big(\mathbf{F}_V(t) - \frac{2}{3} - \frac{1}{4f_\pi^2} t\mathbf{\Pi}_V(t)\Big) + 2\text{ perm.}\\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^4} k_1^\alpha k_2^\beta p_1^\gamma p_2^\delta \int d^4y_1 d^4y_2 d^4y_3 e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1 + ik_2\cdot y_2 - ip_1\cdot y_3}\\
&\times < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(y_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y_2)\mathbf{j}^c_{A\gamma}(y_3)\mathbf{j}^d_{A\delta}(0)\Big)|0>_{\text{conn}}
\end{aligned} \tag{194}$$

a result which was obtained in an earlier version of this paper [39].

The pion electromagnetic form factor $\mathbf{F}_V(q^2)$ is measurable from electroproduction $e^+e^- \to \pi\pi$ for $q^2 > 4m_\pi^2$ and from $\pi^+e^- \to \pi^+e^-$ (hydrogen target) for $q^2 < 0$, whereas the vector correlation function $\mathbf{\Pi}_V(q^2)$ is measurable from electroproduction for $q^2 > 4m_\pi^2$ or semileptonic τ-decays. The first quantity is well described by ρ dominance, whereas the second requires the ρ and the ρ'. It follows that the $\pi\pi$ scattering amplitude beyond tree level should display effects of the ρ, in agreement with previous estimates in the context of chiral perturbation theory [8]. In particular, the ρ contribution through $\mathbf{F}_V$ and $\mathbf{\Pi}_V$ is model-independent, a question that has attracted some attention in the literature [40]. It may also be interesting to compare these results with bootstrap approaches.

There is one subtlety in (193). The absence of the one-pion component implies that $\mathbf{j}^a_{A\mu}$ is $\mathcal{O}(\pi^3)$ so that the last term in (193) is nominally three-loop as shown in Fig. 5a. However, divergences in the subdiagrams require the subtraction of terms such as Fig. 5b, so that effectively the contributions start at one loop.

13.4. Simplification

For later use, we will record the reduction of the scalar form factor $\mathbf{F}_S$, which proceeds in a similar manner to (187-190). From (161)

$$\begin{aligned}\Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2),\Big[\mathbf{S}\hat{\sigma}(y),a^{a\dagger}_{\rm in}(k_1)\Big]\Big] = \quad & -\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{-ik\cdot y}\Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2),\mathbf{S}\pi^a(y)\Big] \\ & +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_{1\alpha}\int d^4y_1 e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1}\Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2),\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)\delta s(y)}\Big]. \quad (195)\end{aligned}$$

Hence we need

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\delta^2}{\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)\delta s(y)}\Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2),\hat{\mathcal{S}}\Big] = +e^{ik_2\cdot y}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{j}^{\alpha a}_A(y_1)\pi^b_{\rm in}(y) \\ &+\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{ik_2\cdot y}\Delta_R(y-y_1)\delta^{ab}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{1\alpha}}+\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y_{1\alpha}}\Big)\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(y_1)} \\ &+\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{ik_2\cdot y_1}\delta^{ab}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{1\alpha}}+ik_2^\alpha\Big)\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(y_1)\delta s(y)} \\ &+\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{ik_2\cdot y}\int d^4z\Delta_R(y-z)\frac{\partial}{\partial z^\mu}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^b_\mu(z)\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)} \\ &+\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{ik_2\cdot y}\Delta_R(y-y_1)\epsilon^{bae}\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta v^e_\alpha(y_1)} \\ &+\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4y_2 e^{ik_2\cdot y_2}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_2^\beta}\frac{\delta^3\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)\delta a^b_\beta(y_2)\delta s(y)} \\ &+\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{ik_2\cdot y_1}\epsilon^{bae}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta v^e_\alpha(y_1)\delta s(y)}\quad . \qquad (196)\end{aligned}$$

Substituting this into (195) and using (111), we find that (195) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}&-\frac{1}{f_\pi}e^{-ik_1\cdot y}\Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2),\mathbf{S}\pi^a(y)\Big] \\ &+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_1^\alpha\int d^4x e^{-ik_1\cdot x+ik_2\cdot y}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{j}^{\alpha a}_A(x)\pi^b_{\rm in}(y)\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta v^{\beta e}(x)} \\ &-\frac{i}{f_\pi^3}e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y}\delta^{ab}\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(y)} \\ &+\frac{i}{f_\pi^3}m_\pi^2\delta^{ab}\int d^4y_1 e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y_1}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta s(y_1)\delta s(y)} \\ &+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}e^{ik_2\cdot y}\int d^4z\Delta_R(y-z)\partial^\beta\Big[\mathbf{S}\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z),a^{a\dagger}_{\rm in}(k_1)\Big] \\ &-\frac{i}{f_\pi^3}k_{1\alpha}k_{2\beta}\int d^4y_1d^4y_2 e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1+ik_2\cdot y_2}\frac{\delta^3\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta a^a_\alpha(y_1)\delta a^b_\beta(y_2)\delta s(y)} \\ &+\frac{1}{f_\pi^3}k_{1\alpha}\epsilon^{bae}\int d^4y_1 e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y_1}\frac{\delta^2\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta v^e_\alpha(y_1)\delta s(y)}. \qquad (197)\end{aligned}$$

again, to leading order in the external fields. Taking the vacuum expectation values gives

$$\begin{aligned}\delta^{ab}\mathbf{F}_S(t) = \quad & -\frac{1}{f_\pi}\delta^{ab}+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\delta^{ab} < 0|\hat{\sigma}|0 > \\ & -\frac{i}{f_\pi}m_\pi^2\delta^{ab}\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y} < 0|T^*\Big(\hat{\sigma}(y)\hat{\sigma}(0)\Big)|0>_{\rm conn} \\ & -\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_1^\alpha k_2^\beta\int d^4y_1 d^4y_2 e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1+ik_2\cdot y_2} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(y_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y_2)\hat{\sigma}(0)\Big)|0>_{\rm conn}\end{aligned} \tag{198}$$

where we have used the fact that the disconnected pieces cancel as usual by (112-113).

Finally, we may split the $\pi\pi$ scattering amplitude (193) into the tree contribution (173), the ρ contribution

$$i\mathcal{T}_{\rm rho}=\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}\epsilon^{abe}\epsilon^{cde}(s-u)\Big(\mathbf{F}_V(t)-1-\frac{t}{4f_\pi^2}\mathbf{\Pi}_V(t)\Big)+2\text{ perm.} \tag{199}$$

and the rest

$$\begin{aligned}i\mathcal{T}_{\rm rest} = \quad & -\frac{2im_\pi^2}{f_\pi}\delta^{ab}\delta^{cd}\Big(\mathbf{F}_S(t)+\frac{1}{f_\pi}-\frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} < 0|\hat{\sigma}|0 > \Big)+2\text{ perm.} \\ & +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}m_\pi^4\delta^{ab}\delta^{cd}\int d^4y e^{-i(k_1-k_2)\cdot y} < 0|T^*\Big(\hat{\sigma}(y)\hat{\sigma}(0)\Big)|0>_{\rm conn.}+2\text{ perm.} \\ & +\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}k_1^\alpha k_2^\beta p_1^\gamma p_2^\delta\int d^4y_1 d^4y_2 d^4y_3 e^{-ik_1\cdot y_2+ik_2\cdot y_2-ip_1\cdot y_3} \\ & \times < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(y_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y_2)\mathbf{j}^c_{A\gamma}(y_3)\mathbf{j}^d_{A\delta}(0)\Big)|0>_{\rm conn.}\end{aligned} \tag{200}$$

We observe that the rest contains the scalar contribution. We stress that the full $\pi\pi$ scattering amplitude (173,199,200) is exact, and does not rely on a model approximation. It follows from chiral symmetry and unitarity. Our result shows explicitly the importance of the ρ and ρ' in the P-wave amplitude, and the relevance of scalar correlations in the S-wave amplitude.

The combination of one-loop chiral perturbation theory and dispersion relations as advocated by Truong and his collaborators [41] to enforce elastic unitarity to all orders, reproduces part of the effects in the P-wave channel (the ρ pole for instance). In the S-channel, the Pade resummation used by these authors leads to spurious poles which are neither expected from our result nor the data. Also, it is important to note that all the S-wave effects given by our relation follows from the explicit breaking of chiral symmetry and vanishes in the chiral limit. This point is absent from the unitarized amplitudes [41]. The latter follow from a theoretical construct that in general tends to blur the role of chiral symmetry.

14. Off-Shell Pion Radiative Decay : $\pi \to e\nu\gamma^*$

Besides πN and $\pi\pi$ scattering, there are other amplitudes of some interest which may be discussed here. One is $\pi \to e\nu\gamma^*$ through the amplitude

$$i\int d^4x e^{iq\cdot x+ik\cdot y} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^a_\mu(x)\mathbf{A}^b_\nu(y)\Big)a^{c\dagger}_{\rm in}(p)|0> \tag{201}$$

where $k = p - q$. From (80) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^a_\mu(x)\mathbf{A}^b_\nu(y)\Big) = T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^a_\mu(x)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\nu}(y)\Big)\\ &+f_\pi g_{\mu\nu}\epsilon^{bad}\delta^4(x-y)\pi^d(y) - f_\pi\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\nu}T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^a_\mu(x)\pi^b(y)\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{202}$$

and from (93)

$$\begin{aligned} &T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^a_\mu(x)\pi^b(y)\Big) = i\Delta_R(y-x)\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial x^\mu}\epsilon^{bad}\pi^d(x)\\ &+\frac{i}{f_\pi}\Delta_R(y-x)\epsilon^{bad}\mathbf{A}^d_\mu(x) + T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^a_\mu(x)\pi^b_{\rm in}(y)\Big)\\ &-\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4z\Delta_R(y-z)\frac{\partial}{\partial z_\beta}T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^a_\mu(x)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z)\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{203}$$

Therefore the amplitude (201) is

$$\begin{aligned} &+f_\pi g_{\mu\nu}\epsilon^{abc} - f_\pi(2p_\mu - q_\mu)k_\nu\epsilon^{abc}\frac{1}{k^2-m^2_\pi}\\ &+i\int d^4x e^{iq\cdot x+ik\cdot y} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^a_\mu(x)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\nu}(y)\Big)a^{c\dagger}_{\rm in}|0>\\ &+ie^{ik\cdot y}\int d^4z\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\nu}\Delta_R(y-z)\frac{\partial}{\partial z^\beta}\int d^4x e^{iq\cdot x}\\ &\times < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^a_\mu(x)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z)\Big)a^{c\dagger}_{\rm in}|0> \end{aligned} \tag{204}$$

The tree terms proportional to the pion decay constant f_π in (204) are standard [42]. From (188), the remainder of (204) is

$$\begin{aligned} &-\Big(g_{\mu\nu} - \frac{k_\mu k_\nu}{k^2-m^2_\pi}\Big)\epsilon^{abc} < 0|\hat\sigma|0>\\ &-(2p_\mu - q_\mu)k_\nu\epsilon^{abc}\frac{m^2_\pi}{(k^2-m^2_\pi)^2} < 0|\hat\sigma|0>\\ &+\frac{i}{f_\pi}\Big(\delta^\beta_\nu - \frac{k_\nu k^\beta}{k^2-m^2_\pi}\Big)\epsilon^{caf}\int d^4x e^{-ik\cdot x} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^f_{A\mu}(x)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(0)\Big)|0>\\ &-\frac{i}{f_\pi}(2p_\mu - q_\mu)k^\alpha\epsilon^{caf}\Big(\delta^\beta_\nu - \frac{k_\nu k^\beta}{k^2-m^2_\pi}\Big)\frac{1}{k^2-m^2_\pi} \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\times \int d^4x e^{-ik\cdot x} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^f_{A\alpha}(x)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(0)\Big)|0 > \\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}p^\gamma\Big(\delta^\beta_\nu - \frac{k_\nu k^\beta}{k^2-m_\pi^2}\Big)\int d^4x d^4z e^{+iq\cdot x-ip\cdot z} \\
&\times < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^a_\mu(x)\mathbf{j}^c_{A\gamma}(z)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(0)\Big)|0 > \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi}\epsilon^{abc}\Big(\delta^\beta_\nu - \frac{k_\nu k^\beta}{k^2-m_\pi^2}\Big)\Big(-g_{\mu\beta}q^2+q_\mu q_\beta\Big)\ \Pi_V(q^2) \qquad (205)
\end{aligned}
$$

The decay amplitude $\pi \rightarrow e\nu\gamma^*$ is sensitive to the way chiral symmetry is broken in the vacuum through $< 0|\hat{\sigma}|0 >$.

15. On-Shell Pion Radiative Decay : $\pi \rightarrow e\nu\gamma$

The on-shell $\pi \rightarrow e\nu\gamma$ decay follows from

$$
i\epsilon^\mu(q)\int d^4x e^{iq\cdot(x-y)+ip\cdot y} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^a_\mu(x)\mathbf{A}^b_\nu(y)\Big)a^{c\dagger}_{\rm in}(p)|0 > \qquad (206)
$$

The amplitude (206) may be obtained from (204,205) by contracting with the photon polarization vector $\epsilon^\mu(q)$ obeying $\epsilon\cdot q = 0$ and setting the photon on shell $q^2 = 0$. The result is

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\epsilon_\nu(q)\epsilon^{abc}f_\pi + \frac{\epsilon(q)\cdot p}{p\cdot q}(p-q)_\nu\epsilon^{abc}f_\pi \\
&-\Big(\delta^\mu_\nu - \frac{p^\mu k_\nu}{k^2-m_\pi^2} + 2m_\pi^2\frac{p^\mu k_\nu}{(k^2-m_\pi^2)^2}\Big)\ \epsilon_\mu(q)\epsilon^{abc} < 0|\hat{\sigma}|0 > \\
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi}\epsilon^\mu(q)\epsilon^{cad}\Big(\delta^\alpha_\mu - 2\frac{k^\alpha k_\mu}{k^2-m_\pi^2}\Big)\Big(\delta^\beta_\nu - \frac{k^\beta k_\nu}{k^2-m_\pi^2}\Big)\int d^4y e^{-ik\cdot y} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^d_{A\alpha}(y)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(0)\Big)|0 > \\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}\epsilon^\alpha(q)p^\gamma\Big(\delta^\beta_\nu - \frac{k^\beta k_\nu}{k^2-m_\pi^2}\Big)\int d^4x d^4z e^{iq\cdot x-ip\cdot z} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^a_\alpha(x)\mathbf{j}^c_{A\gamma}(z)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(0)\Big)|0 > \qquad (207)
\end{aligned}
$$

As a check, we note that the apparent double pole cancels by (112-113). Again, we note that the tree contribution in (207) is sensitive to the way chiral symmetry is broken in the vacuum through $< 0|\hat{\sigma}|0 >$.

16. Photon-Photon Collision : $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$

The collision of two photons at threshold has attracted considerable attention recently in the context of chiral perturbation theory [43] and dispersion techniques [45]. These calculations are interesting in light of the experiments carried out by the MARK II collaboration at SLAC [46] and the Crystal Ball collaboration at DESY [47]. Future high-energy experiments are planned at DAΦNE at Frascati with energies up to 600 MeV.

While chiral perturbation theory implements unitarity perturbatively, thus giving up on resonant behaviour, dispersion techniques give up on the consequences of chiral dynamics. In this section, we will address this issue from our point of view. The advantage of our formalism is that our amplitudes are unexpanded. They are rearranged using the master equation, thus chiral dynamics, with full consistency with analyticity and unitarity. The contributions of the various resonances appear in the form of various vacuum correlators.

The amplitude for $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & +\int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y - iq_2\cdot z} < 0|a^a_{\rm in}(k_1) a^b_{\rm in}(k_2)\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\Big)|0 > \\ = \quad & -\int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y - iq_2\cdot z} < 0|\frac{\delta^2}{\delta v^{\mu c}(y)\delta v^{\nu d}(z)}\Big[a^a_{\rm in}(k_1),\Big[a^b_{\rm in}(k_2),\hat{\mathcal{S}}\Big]\Big]|0 > \end{aligned} \tag{208}$$

The first term of (136) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & +\mathbf{S}\int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y - iq_2\cdot z}\Big(e^{ik_1\cdot y}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu} - \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y^\mu}\Big)\epsilon^{ace}\pi^e_{\rm in}(y)\Big) \\ & \times\Big(e^{ik_2\cdot z}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial z^\nu} - \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial z^\nu}\Big)\epsilon^{bdf}\pi^f_{\rm in}(z)\Big) \\ & +\Big(q_1\ \mu\ c \leftrightarrow q_2\ \nu\ d\Big) \\ = \quad & -\mathbf{S}(2k_{1\mu} - q_{1\mu})(2k_{2\nu} - q_{2\nu})\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{bdf} \\ & \times\int d^4y d^4z e^{i(k_1-q_1)\cdot y + i(k_2-q_2)\cdot z}\pi^e_{\rm in}(y)\pi^f_{\rm in}(z) \\ & +\Big(q_1\ \mu\ c \leftrightarrow q_2\ \nu\ d\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{209}$$

The second term in (136) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & +\frac{i}{f_\pi}\int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y - iq_2\cdot z}\int d^4z_1 e^{ik_1\cdot z_1}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{1\alpha}}\frac{\delta^2}{\delta a^{\alpha a}(z_1)\delta v^{\mu c}(y)} \\ & \times\Big(e^{ik_2\cdot z}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial z^\nu} - \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial z^\nu}\Big)\epsilon^{bdf}\pi^f_{\rm in}(z)\Big) \\ & +\Big(q_1\ \mu\ c \leftrightarrow q_2\ \nu\ d\Big) + ... \\ = \quad & +\frac{i}{f_\pi}(2k_{2\nu} - q_{2\nu})k_1^\alpha\epsilon^{bdf}\int d^4y d^4z d^4z_1 e^{-iq_1\cdot y + i(k_2-q_2)\cdot z + ik_1\cdot z_1} \\ & \times\Big(\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\Big)\Big)\pi^f_{\rm in}(z) \\ & +\Big(q_1\ \mu\ c \leftrightarrow q_2\ \nu\ d\Big) + ... \end{aligned} \tag{210}$$

where ... stands for terms with zero vacuum expectation values. Note that (209-210) also vanish for spacelike photons $q_1^2 < 0$ and $q_2^2 < 0$ after taking the vacuum expectation value, since only the annihilation part of $\pi_{\rm in}(y)$ is picked up as before.

The third term of (136) gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
& +i\mathbf{S}\int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y-iq_2\cdot z} \\
& \times\Big(e^{ik_2\cdot y}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu}-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y^\mu}\Big)\epsilon^{bcf}\Delta_R(y-z)\epsilon^{fda}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial z^\nu}-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial z^\nu}\Big)e^{ik_1\cdot z}\Big) \\
& +\mathbf{S}\int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y-iq_2\cdot z}\Big(e^{ik_2\cdot y}\epsilon^{bce}\epsilon^{eda}\delta^4(y-z)e^{ik_1\cdot z}\Big) \\
& +\Big(q_1\ \mu\ c\leftrightarrow q_2\ \nu\ d\Big)+.... \\
= \quad & +(2\pi)^4 i\delta^4(k_1+k_2-q_1-q_2)\mathbf{S}\ (2k_{2\mu}-q_{1\mu})(2k_{1\nu}-q_{2\nu})\epsilon^{bcf}\epsilon^{fda}\frac{1}{(k_2-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2} \\
& +(2\pi)^4 i\delta^4(k_1+k_2-q_1-q_2)\mathbf{S}\epsilon^{bcf}\epsilon^{fda}g_{\mu\nu} \\
& +\Big(q_1\ \mu\ c\leftrightarrow q_2\ \nu\ d\Big)+.... \qquad (211)
\end{aligned}
$$

The fourth term gives (210) with k_1, a and k_2, b exchanged, and hence zero after taking the vacuum expectation value.

The term (138) gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}m_\pi^2\, g_{\mu\nu}\int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y-iq_2\cdot z+ik_1\cdot y}\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{ebd}\delta^4(y-z) \\
& \times\int d^4z_1\Delta_R(z-z_1)if_\pi\mathbf{S}\hat{\sigma}(z_1)e^{ik_2\cdot z_1} \\
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}m_\pi^2\int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y-iq_2\cdot z} \\
& \times\Big(e^{ik_1\cdot y}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu}-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y^\mu}\Big)\epsilon^{ace}\Delta_R(y-z)\epsilon^{edb}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial z^\nu}-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial z^\nu}\Big)\Big) \\
& \times\int d^4z_1\Delta_R(z-z_1)if_\pi\mathbf{S}\hat{\sigma}(z_1)e^{ik_2\cdot z_1} \\
& +3\ \text{perm.} \\
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}m_\pi^2\int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y-iq_2\cdot z} \\
& \times\int d^4z_1\Big(e^{ik_1\cdot y}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu}-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y^\mu}\Big)\epsilon^{ace}\Delta_R(y-z_1)\Big) \\
& \times\Big(e^{ik_2\cdot z}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial z^\nu}-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial z^\nu}\Big)\epsilon^{bde}\Delta_R(z-z_1)if_\pi\mathbf{S}\hat{\sigma}(z_1)\Big) \\
& +\Big(k_1\ \ a\leftrightarrow k_2\ \ b\Big)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&& -\frac{i}{f_\pi} m_\pi^2 \delta^{ab} \int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y - iq_2\cdot z} \int d^4z_1 e^{i(k_1+k_2)\cdot z_1} \mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\hat{\sigma}(z_1)\Big) \\
&= & +\frac{i}{f_\pi} m_\pi^2 \epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{edb} \frac{1}{(k_1-q_1-q_2)^2-m_\pi^2} \int d^4z_1 e^{i(k_1+k_2-q_1-q_2)\cdot z_1} \mathbf{S}\hat{\sigma}(z_1) \\
&& -\frac{i}{f_\pi} m_\pi^2 \epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{edb} (2k_{1\mu}-q_{1\mu})(2k_{1\nu}-2q_{1\nu}-q_{2\nu}) \frac{1}{(k_1-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2} \\
&& \times \frac{1}{(k_1-q_1-q_2)^2-m_\pi^2} \int d^4z_1 e^{i(k_1+k_2-q_1-q_2)\cdot z_1} \mathbf{S}\hat{\sigma}(z_1) \\
&& +3 \ \text{perm.} \\
&& -\frac{i}{f_\pi} m_\pi^2 \epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{bde} (2k_{1\mu}-q_{1\mu})(2k_{2\nu}-q_{2\nu}) \frac{1}{(k_1-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2} \\
&& \times \frac{1}{(k_1-q_2)^2-m_\pi^2} \int d^4z_1 e^{i(k_1+k_2-q_1-q_2)\cdot z_1} \mathbf{S}\hat{\sigma}(z_1) \\
&& +\Big(k_1 \ \ a \leftrightarrow k_2 \ \ b\Big) \\
&& -\frac{i}{f_\pi} m_\pi^2 \delta^{ab} \int d^4y d^4z d^4z_1 e^{-iq_1\cdot y - iq_2\cdot z + i(k_1+k_2)\cdot z_1} \mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\hat{\sigma}(z_1)\Big) \qquad (212)
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking the vacuum expectation value at this point leads to ambiguities, and will be postponed till later.

From (139) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&& +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2} \int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y - iq_2\cdot z} \\
&& \times\Bigg(e^{ik_2\cdot y}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu} - \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y^\mu}\Big)\epsilon^{bcf} \int d^4z_2 \Delta_R(y-z_2) \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{2\beta}} \\
&& \times\Big(e^{ik_1\cdot z_2}\epsilon^{afg}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^g_\beta(z_2)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\Big)\Big)\Bigg) \\
&& +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2} \int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y - iq_2\cdot z + ik_2\cdot y + ik_1\cdot y} \epsilon^{bch}\epsilon^{ahg} \mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^g_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\Big) \\
&& +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2} \int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y - iq_2\cdot z} \int d^4z_2 e^{ik_2\cdot z_2} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{2\beta}} \\
&& \times\Bigg(e^{ik_1\cdot y}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu} - \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y^\mu}\Big)\epsilon^{ace}\Delta_R(y-z_2)\epsilon^{ebg}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^g_\beta(z_2)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\Big)\Bigg) \\
&& +\Big(q_1 \ \ \mu \ \ c \leftrightarrow q_2 \ \ \nu \ \ d\Big) \\
&& +\frac{i}{f_\pi^2} \int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y - iq_2\cdot z} \int d^4z_2 e^{ik_1\cdot z_2} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{2\beta}} \\
&& \Big(e^{ik_2\cdot z_2}\epsilon^{abg}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^g_\beta(z_2)\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\Big)\Big) \\
&& + \ \ldots \\
&= & -\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}(2k_{1\mu}-q_{1\mu})k_2^\beta \epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{ebg} \frac{1}{(k_1-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\times\int d^4zd^4z_2e^{-iq_2\cdot z+i(k_1+k_2-q_1)\cdot z_2}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^g_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\Big)\\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\epsilon^{bch}\epsilon^{ahg}\int d^4yd^4ze^{i(k_1+k_2-q_1)\cdot y-iq_2\cdot z}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^g_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\Big)\\
&+3\ \text{perm.}\\
&+\frac{1}{2f_\pi^2}(k_2^\beta-k_1^\beta)\epsilon^{abg}\int d^4yd^4zd^4z_2e^{-q_1\cdot y-iq_2\cdot z+i(k_1+k_2)\cdot z_2}\\
&\times\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^g_\beta(z_2)\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\Big)+\ \ldots
\end{aligned}
\tag{213}
$$

where we have used the Ward identities (146) and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{2\beta}}T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^g_\beta(z_2)\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\Big)\\
=\quad&+i\epsilon^{gce}\delta^4(z_2-y)T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^e_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\Big)+i\epsilon^{gde}\delta^4(z_2-z)T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^e_\nu(z)\Big)
\end{aligned}
\tag{214}
$$

From (140) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\,g_{\mu\nu}\int d^4yd^4ze^{-iq_1\cdot y-iq_2\cdot z+ik_1\cdot y}\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{edg}\delta^4(y-z)\\
&\times\int d^4z_1\Delta_R(z-z_1)\int d^4z_2e^{ik_2\cdot z_2}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{1\alpha}}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{2\beta}}\\
&\times\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^g_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\Big)\\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4yd^4ze^{-iq_1\cdot y-iq_2\cdot z}\\
&\times\Big(e^{ik_1\cdot y}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu}-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y^\mu}\Big)\epsilon^{ace}\Delta_R(y-z)\epsilon^{edg}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial z^\nu}-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial z^\nu}\Big)\Big)\\
&\times\int d^4z_1\Delta_R(z-z_1)\int d^4z_2e^{ik_2\cdot z_2}\\
&\times\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{1\alpha}}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{2\beta}}(-)\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^g_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\Big)\\
&+3\ \text{perm.}\\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4yd^4ze^{-iq_1\cdot y-iq_2\cdot z}\\
&\times\Big[e^{ik_1\cdot y}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu}-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y^\mu}\Big)\epsilon^{ace}\int d^4z_1\Delta_R(y-z_1)\\
&\times\Big(e^{ik_2\cdot z}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial z^\nu}-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial z^\nu}\Big)\epsilon^{bdf}\int d^4z_2\Delta_R(z-z_2)\Big)\\
&\times\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{1\alpha}}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{2\beta}}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^g_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\Big)\Big]\\
&+\Big(k_1\ \ a\leftrightarrow k_2\ \ b\Big)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
= \quad & -\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{edb}(k_1^\alpha - q_1^\alpha - q_2^\alpha)k_2^\beta \frac{1}{(k_1-q_1-q_2)^2-m_\pi^2} \\
& \int d^4z_1 d^4z_2 e^{i(k_1-q_1-q_2)\cdot z_1+ik_2\cdot z_2}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^g_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\Big) \\
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}(2k_{1\mu}-q_{1\mu})(2k_{1\nu}-2q_{1\nu}-q_{2\nu})(k_1^\alpha-q_1^\alpha-q_2^\alpha)k_2^\beta\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{edg} \\
& \times\frac{1}{(k_1-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2}\frac{1}{(k_1-q_1-q_2)^2-m_\pi^2}\int d^4z_1 d^4z_2 e^{i(k_1-q_1-q_2)\cdot z_1+ik_2\cdot z_2} \\
& \times\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^g_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2) \\
& +3\ \text{ perm.} \\
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{bdf}(2k_{1\mu}-q_{1\mu})(2k_{2\nu}-q_{2\nu})(k_1^\alpha-q_1^\alpha)(k_2^\beta-q_{2\beta}) \\
& \times\frac{1}{(k_1-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2}\frac{1}{(k_2-q_2)^2-m_\pi^2} \\
& \int d^4z_1 d^4z_2 e^{i(k_1-q_1)\cdot z_1+i(k_2-q_2)\cdot z_2}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^e_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^f_{A\beta}(z_2)\Big) \\
& +\Big(k_1\ \ a\leftrightarrow k_2\ \ b\Big)
\end{aligned}
\tag{215}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y-iq_2\cdot z} \\
& \times\Big(e^{ik_1\cdot y}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu}-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y^\mu}\Big)\epsilon^{ace}\Delta_R(y-z)\epsilon^{edg}\Big) \\
& \times\int d^4z_2 e^{ik_2\cdot z_2}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{2\beta}}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^g_{A\nu}(z)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\Big) \\
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y-iq_2\cdot z} \\
& \times\Big[e^{ik_1\cdot y}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu}-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y^\mu}\Big)\epsilon^{ace}\int d^4z_1\Delta_R(y-z_1)\epsilon^{bdh} \\
& \times e^{ik_2\cdot z}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{1\alpha}}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^e_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^h_{A\nu}(z)\Big)\Big] \\
& +\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y-iq_2\cdot z}\Big[e^{ik_1\cdot y}\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu}-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y^\mu}\Big)\epsilon^{ace} \\
& \times\int d^4z_1\Delta_R(y-z_1)\int d^4z_2 e^{ik_2\cdot z_2}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{1\alpha}}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{2\beta}} \\
& \times\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^e_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\Big)\Big] \\
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y-iq_2\cdot z+ik_1\cdot y+ik_2\cdot z}\epsilon^{acg}\epsilon^{bdh} \\
& \times\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^g_{A\mu}(y)\mathbf{j}^h_{A\nu}(z)\Big)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& +\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y-iq_2\cdot z+ik_1\cdot y}\epsilon^{acg}\int d^4z_2 e^{ik_2\cdot z_2} \\
& \times\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{2\beta}}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^g_{A\mu}(y)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\Big) \\
& +\Big(k_1\ \ a\leftrightarrow k_2\ \ b\Big) \\
& -\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y-iq_2\cdot z}\int d^4z_1 d^4z_2 e^{ik_1\cdot z_1+ik_2\cdot z_2} \\
& \times\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{1\alpha}}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{2\beta}}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\Big) \\
= \quad & -\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}(2k_{1\mu}-q_{1\mu})k_2^\beta\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{edg}\frac{1}{(k_1-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2} \\
& \times\int d^4z d^4z_2 e^{i(k_1-q_1-q_2)\cdot z+ik_2\cdot z_2}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^g_{A\nu}(z)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\Big) \\
& -\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}(2k_{1\mu}-q_{1\mu})(k_1^\alpha-q_1^\alpha)\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{bdh}\frac{1}{(k_1-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2} \\
& \times\int d^4z_1 d^4z e^{i(k_1-q_1)\cdot z_1+i(k_2-q_2)\cdot z}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^e_{A\alpha}(z)\mathbf{j}^h_{A\nu}(z)\Big) \\
& -\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}(2k_{1\mu}-q_{1\mu})(k_1^\alpha-q_1^\alpha)k_2^\beta\epsilon^{ace}\frac{1}{(k_1-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2} \\
& \times\int d^4z d^4z_1 d^4z_2 e^{-iq_2\cdot z+i(k_1-q_1)\cdot z_1+ik_2\cdot z_2}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^e_{A\alpha}(z)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\Big) \\
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\epsilon^{acg}\epsilon^{bdh}\int d^4y d^4z e^{+i(k_1-q_1)\cdot z_1+i(k_2-q_2)\cdot z_2}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^g_{A\mu}(y)\mathbf{j}^h_{A\nu}(z)\Big) \\
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_2^\beta\epsilon^{acg}\int d^4y d^4z d^4z_2 e^{+i(k_1-q_1)\cdot y-iq_2\cdot z+ik_2\cdot z_2}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^g_{A\mu}(y)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\Big) \\
& +\Big(k_1\ \ a\leftrightarrow k_2\ \ b\Big) \\
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_1^\alpha k_2^\beta\int d^4y d^4z d^4z_1 d^4z_2 e^{-q_1\cdot y-iq_2\cdot z+ik_1\cdot z_1+ik_2\cdot z_2} \\
& \times\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\Big)
\end{aligned}
\tag{216}
$$

The sum of (212) and (215) gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{i}{f_\pi}\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{edb}\,g_{\mu\nu}\int d^4z_1 e^{i(k_1+k_2-q_1-q_2)\cdot z_1}\mathbf{S}\hat{\sigma}(z_1) \\
& +\frac{i}{f_\pi}\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{edb}(2k_{1\mu}-q_{1\mu})(2k_{2\nu}-2q_{1\nu}-q_{2\nu})\frac{1}{(k_1-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2} \\
& \times\int d^4z_1 e^{i(k_1+k_2-q_1-q_2)\cdot z_1}\mathbf{S}\hat{\sigma}(z_1) \\
& +3\ \ \text{perm.} \\
& -\frac{i}{f_\pi}m_\pi^2\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{bde}(2k_{1\mu}-q_{1\mu})(2k_{2\nu}-q_{2\nu})\frac{1}{(k_1-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2}\frac{1}{(k_2-q_2)^2-m_\pi^2}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\times \int d^4z_1 e^{i(k_1+k_2-q_1-q_2)\cdot z_1}\mathbf{S}\hat{\sigma}(z_1) \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{bde}(2k_{1\mu}-q_{1\mu})(2k_{2\nu}-q_{2\nu})(k_1^\alpha-q_1^\alpha)(k_2^\beta-q_2^\beta) \\
&\times\frac{1}{(k_1-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2}\frac{1}{(k_2-q_2)^2-m_\pi^2} \\
&\times\int d^4z_1 d^4z_2 e^{i(k_1-q_1)\cdot z_1+i(k_2-q_2)\cdot z_2}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^e_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^f_{A\beta}(z_2)\Big) \\
&+\Big(k_1\ \ a\leftrightarrow k_2\ \ b\Big) \\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}m_\pi^2\delta^{ab}\int d^4yd^4zd^4z_1 e^{-iq_1\cdot y-iq_2\cdot z+i(k_1+k_2)\cdot z_1}\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\hat{\sigma}(z_1)\Big) \\
&+....
\end{aligned}
\tag{217}
$$

There is now no ambiguity in taking the vacuum expectation values. Dividing out $(2\pi)^4\delta^4(k_1+k_2-q_1-q_2)$, we obtain from (211,212,216,217) respectively,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+i(2k_{2\mu}-q_{1\mu})(2k_{1\nu}-q_{2\nu})\epsilon^{bcf}\epsilon^{fda}\frac{1}{(k_2-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2} \\
&+i\epsilon^{bce}\epsilon^{eda}g_{\mu\nu}+\Big(q_1\ \mu\ c\leftrightarrow q_2\ \nu\ d\Big)
\end{aligned}
\tag{218}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}(2k_{1\mu}-q_{1\mu})(-k_{2\nu}q_2^2+k_2\cdot q_2q_{2\nu})\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{ebd} \\
&\times\frac{1}{(k_1-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2}\Pi_V(q_2^2) \\
&-\frac{i}{2f_\pi^2}\epsilon^{bch}\epsilon^{ahd}(-g_{\mu\nu}q_2^2+q_{2\mu}q_{2\nu})\Pi_V(q_2^2) \\
&+3\ \ \text{perm.} \\
&+\frac{1}{2f_\pi^2}(k_2^\beta-k_1^\beta)\epsilon^{abg}\int d^4yd^4ze^{-iq_1\cdot y-iq_2\cdot z} \\
&\times <0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\mathbf{V}^g_\beta(0)\Big)|0>
\end{aligned}
\tag{219}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}(2(k_{1\mu}-q_{1\mu})k_2^\beta\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{edg}\frac{1}{(k_1-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2} \\
&\times\int d^4z_2e^{+ik_2\cdot z_2}<0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\mathbf{j}^g_{A\nu}(0)\Big)|0> \\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}(2k_{1\mu}-q_{1\mu})(k_1^\alpha-q_1^\alpha)\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{bdh}\frac{1}{(k_1-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2} \\
&\times\int d^4z_1e^{i(k_1-q_1)\cdot z_1}<0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^e_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^h_{A\nu}(0)\Big)|0> \\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}(2k_{1\mu}-q_{1\mu})(k_1^\alpha-q_1^\alpha)k_2^\beta\epsilon^{ace}\frac{1}{(k_1-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\times \int d^4z_1 d^4z_2 e^{+i(k_1-q_1)\cdot z_1+i(k_2-q_2)\cdot z_2} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^e_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(0)\Big)|0 > \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\epsilon^{acg}\epsilon^{bdh}\int d^4y e^{+i(k_1-q_1)\cdot y} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^g_{A\mu}(y)\mathbf{j}^h_{A\nu}(0)\Big)|0 > \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_2^\beta\epsilon^{acg}\int d^4y d^4z_2 e^{+i(k_1-q_1)\cdot y+ik_2\cdot z_2} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^g_{A\mu}(y)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(0)\Big)|0 > \\
&+\Big(k_1 \;\; a\leftrightarrow k_2 \;\; b\Big) \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_1^\alpha k_2^\beta \int d^4y d^4z_1 d^4z_2 e^{-iq_1\cdot y+ik_1\cdot z_1+ik_2\cdot z_2} \\
&\times < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(0)\Big)|0 > \qquad (220)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{edb}g_{\mu\nu} < 0|\hat{\sigma}|0 > \\
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi}\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{edb}(2k_{1\mu}-q_{1\mu})(2k_{2\nu}-q_{2\nu})\frac{1}{(k_1-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2} < 0|\hat{\sigma}|0 > \\
&+3\ \text{perm.} \\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}m_\pi^2\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{bde}(2k_{1\mu}-q_{1\mu})(2k_{2\nu}-q_{2\nu}) \\
&\times\frac{1}{(k_1-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2}\frac{1}{(k_2-q_2)^2-m_\pi^2} < 0|\hat{\sigma}|0 > \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{bdf}(2k_{1\mu}-q_{1\mu})(2k_{2\nu}-q_{2\nu})(k_1^\alpha-q_1^\alpha)(k_2^\beta-q_2^\beta) \\
&\times\frac{1}{(k_1-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2}\frac{1}{(k_2-q_2)^2-m_\pi^2} \\
&\times\int d^4z_1 e^{i(k_1-q_1)\cdot z_1} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^e_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^f_{A\beta}(0)\Big)|0 > \\
&+\Big(k_1 \;\; a\leftrightarrow k_2 \;\; b\Big) \\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}m_\pi^2\delta^{ab}\int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y-iq_2\cdot z} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\hat{\sigma}(0)\Big)|0 > \qquad (221)
\end{aligned}
$$

The photon-photon collision process is sensitive to the way chiral symmetry is broken in the vacuum through $< 0|\hat{\sigma}|0 >$. The expressions (218-221) are our exact result for the $\gamma\gamma\to\pi\pi$ process. It is important to stress that this result follows only from the dictates of chiral symmetry and unitarity.

At low energy, we expect the two-point correlation function $\mathbf{\Pi}_V$ to be ρ and ρ' dominated, while the two-point correlators $< \mathbf{j}_A\mathbf{j}_A >$ to be a_1 dominated. The three- and higher-point correlation functions involve more complex structure. We note that the isoscalar part of the electromagnetic current contributes to both the isospin $I = 0, 1$

channels of $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$. Thus an exact assessment of the various correlation functions entering (218-221) require a full $SU(3)\times SU(3)$ treatment. This goes beyond the scope of the present analysis. An estimation of the various correlators in (218-221) using $SU(2)\times SU(2)$ chiral counting arguments will be given below.

For the process $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, the nearness of the pion pole to the physical region means that the effects of the high mass resonances ρ , ρ' , ω , a_1 ..., are small. Thus, the process is dominated by the Born terms. Since our result accounts properly for the Born terms, we expect overall agreement with the data much like the Born approximation with some radiative corrections [48], or one-loop chiral perturbation theory [43]. However, the large discrepancy noted between one-loop chiral perturbation theory and the Crystal Ball data [47] for $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ shows some evidence of correlations, since the Born terms vanish in this case. This has been partly confirmed by the inclusion of vector mesons to one-loop chiral perturbation theory by Ko [44], and the use of dispersion analysis by Morgan and Pennington and others [45]. At low energy, the ω, the ρ and the a_1 play an important role in the fusion process to neutral pions. These effects are all accounted for in (218-221) in a model independent way. We also note that some of these correlations do appear in a recent two-loop calculation by Belluci, Gasser and Sainio in the context of chiral perturbation theory [49], through pion rescattering and unspecified counter terms. Since our result (218-221) contains the unexpanded correlation functions as dictated by chiral symmetry and unitarity, it would be interesting to carry a more systematic comparison between our results, the approximate estimations and the available data within the 1 GeV range.

17. Compton Scattering : $\gamma\pi \rightarrow \gamma\pi$

When atoms are immersed in an electromagnetic cavity, their interaction with light induces a polarisation of the electric charge distributions. These electromagnetic deformations of an extended object can be characterized by electric and magnetic polarisabilities. Compton scattering of light off pions through atomic targets via Primakoff effect [33, 38] and photon-photon collision [46, 47] have led to electric polarisabilities for charged pions ranging from about 2 10^{-4} fm^3 to 20 10^{-4} fm^3. The order of magnitude discrepancy between the quoted data illustrates the experimental difficulties encountered in the threshold measurements as well as the systematic uncertainties associated to the way the various extrapolations are performed.

This notwithstanding, there have appeared a number of estimations of the pion polarisabilities using various chiral models [50] and chiral perturbation theory [51]. In the latter the reaction $\gamma\gamma \to \pi\pi$ and its crossed version $\gamma\pi \to \gamma\pi$ were used. While the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$ seems to be well described by one loop chiral perturbation theory (mostly the Born amplitude though), the reaction $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\pi^0$ is totally off at one loop. Dispersion techniques and two-loop calculations have been carried out recently to try to account for the deficiency of the one-loop calculation [52, 49], leading to new estimates for the pion polarisabilities.

In our approach, Compton scattering off pions will be treated exactly to first order in the electromagnetic charge. Unitarity will be maintained to all orders, and the strong correlations in the neutral channel will be expressed in terms of vacuum correlators. The Compton scattering amplitude follows from the matrix element

$$\int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y+iq_2\cdot z} < 0|a^b_{\rm in}(k_2)\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\Big)a^{a\dagger}_{\rm in}(k_1)|0> \tag{222}$$

This amplitude follows from the result (205,221) for $\gamma\gamma \to \pi\pi$ by crossing $q_2 \leftrightarrow -q_2$ and $k_1 \leftrightarrow -k_1$. Modulo the overall factor $(2\pi)^4\delta^4(k_1+q_1-k_2-q_2)$ for energy momentum conservation, the result is

$$\begin{aligned} &-i(2k_{2\mu}-q_{1\mu})(2k_{1\nu}-q_{2\nu})\epsilon^{bcf}\epsilon^{fda}\frac{1}{(k_2-q_1)^2-m_\pi^2} \\ &+i\epsilon^{bce}\epsilon^{eda}g_{\mu\nu}+\Big(q_1\ \mu\ c \leftrightarrow -q_2\ \nu\ d\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{223}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &-\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}(2k_{1\mu}+q_{1\mu})(-k_{2\nu}q_2^2+k_2\cdot q_2q_{2\nu})\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{ebd} \\ &\times\frac{1}{(k_1+q_1)^2-m_\pi^2}\Pi_V(q_2^2) \\ &-\frac{i}{2f_\pi^2}\epsilon^{bch}\epsilon^{ahd}(-g_{\mu\nu}q_2^2+q_{2\mu}q_{2\nu})\Pi_V(q_2^2) \\ &+3\ \text{ perm.} \\ &+\frac{1}{2f_\pi^2}(k_2^\beta+k_1^\beta)\epsilon^{abg}\int d^4yd^4ze^{-iq_1\cdot y+iq_2\cdot z} \\ &\times<0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\mathbf{V}^g_\beta(0)\Big)|0> \end{aligned} \tag{224}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}(2k_{1\mu}+q_{1\mu})k_2^\beta\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{edg}\frac{1}{(k_1+q_1)^2-m_\pi^2}\\
&\times\int d^4z_2e^{+ik_2\cdot z_2}<0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\mathbf{j}^g_{A\nu}(0)\Big)|0>\\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}(2k_{1\mu}+q_{1\mu})(k_1^\alpha+q_1^\alpha)\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{bdh}\frac{1}{(k_1+q_1)^2-m_\pi^2}\\
&\times\int d^4z_1e^{-i(k_1+q_1)\cdot z_1}<0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^e_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^h_{A\nu}(0)\Big)|0>\\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}(2k_{1\mu}+q_{1\mu})(k_1^\alpha+q_1^\alpha)k_2^\beta\epsilon^{ace}\frac{1}{(k_1+q_1)^2-m_\pi^2}\\
&\times\int d^4z_1d^4z_2e^{-i(k_1+q_1)\cdot z_1+i(k_2+q_2)\cdot z_2}<0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^e_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(0)\Big)|0>\\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\epsilon^{acg}\epsilon^{bdh}\int d^4ye^{-i(k_1+q_1)\cdot y}<0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^g_{A\mu}(y)\mathbf{j}^h_{A\nu}(0)\Big)|0>\\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_2^\beta\epsilon^{acg}\int d^4yd^4z_2e^{-i(k_1+q_1)\cdot y+ik_2\cdot z_2}<0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^g_{A\mu}(y)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(0)\Big)|0>\\
&+\Big(-k_1\ \ a\leftrightarrow k_2\ \ b\Big)\\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_1^\alpha k_2^\beta\int d^4yd^4z_1d^4z_2e^{-q_1\cdot y-ik_1\cdot z_1+ik_2\cdot z_2}\\
&\times<0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(0)\Big)|0>
\end{aligned}
\qquad (225)
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{edb}<0|\hat\sigma|0>\\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{edb}(2k_{1\mu}+q_{1\mu})(2k_{2\nu}-2q_{1\nu}-q_{2\nu})\frac{1}{(k_1+q_1)^2-m_\pi^2}<0|\hat\sigma|0>\\
&+3\ \text{ perm.}\\
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi}m_\pi^2\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{bde}(2k_{1\mu}+q_{1\mu})(2k_{2\nu}+q_{2\nu})\\
&\times\frac{1}{(k_1+q_1)^2-m_\pi^2}\frac{1}{(k_2+q_2)^2-m_\pi^2}<0|\hat\sigma|0>\\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\epsilon^{ace}\epsilon^{bdf}(2k_{1\mu}+q_{1\mu})(2k_{2\nu}+q_{2\nu})(k_1^\alpha+q_1^\alpha)(k_2^\beta+q_2^\beta)\\
&\times\frac{1}{(k_1+q_1)^2-m_\pi^2}\frac{1}{(k_2+q_2)^2-m_\pi^2}\\
&\times\int d^4z_1e^{-i(k_1+q_1)\cdot z_1}<0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^e_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^f_{A\beta}(0)\Big)|0>\\
&+\Big(-k_1\ \ a\leftrightarrow k_2\ \ b\Big)\\
&-\frac{i}{f_\pi}m_\pi^2\delta^{ab}\int d^4yd^4ze^{-iq_1\cdot y+iq_2\cdot z}<0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\hat\sigma(0)\Big)|0>
\end{aligned}
\qquad (226)
$$

which is valid for isospin 0 and 2 channels. Again, we note that the Compton scattering process is sensitive to the chiral symmetry breaking term. The expressions(223-226) are our full result for the Compton process $\gamma\pi \to \gamma\pi$. Most of the remarks we made above for the fusion process $\gamma\gamma \to \pi\pi$ apply *verbatim* to $\gamma\pi \to \gamma\pi$ by crossing. Below we will give an estimation for (223-226) using $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ chiral counting arguments.

The Compton amplitudes for neutral and charged pions can be used for a precise definition of the pion polarisabilities. Since (208) by crossing yields (222), we define the neutral ($a = b = 3$) and the charged amplitude ($a = b = 1$) to be

$$\mathcal{V}^{ab}_{\mu\nu} = \quad + \int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y - iq_2\cdot z} < 0|a^a_{\rm in}(k_1)a^b_{\rm in}(k_2)\mathbf{S}T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^3_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^3_\nu(z)\Big)|0 > \qquad (227)$$

Factoring out $(2\pi)^4\delta^4(q_1 + q_2 - k_1 - k_2)$, using covariance and gauge invariance yield [49]

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mu\nu} = A(s,t,u)\mathbf{T}_{1\mu\nu} + B(s,t,u)\mathbf{T}_{2\mu\nu} \qquad (228)$$

with generically

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{T}_{1\mu\nu} = & \quad \frac{s}{2}g_{\mu\nu} - q_{1\mu}q_{2\nu} \\ \mathbf{T}_{1\mu\nu} = & \quad 2s\Delta_\mu\Delta_\nu - \nu^2 g_{\mu\nu} - 2\nu\Big(q_{1\nu}\Delta_\mu - q_{2\mu}\Delta_\nu\Big)\end{aligned} \qquad (229)$$

and $\Delta_\mu = (k_1 - k_2)_\mu$ and $\nu = t - u$. The amplitudes A and B are analytic in s, t, u and symmetric under crossing $(t, u) \leftrightarrow (u, t)$. For $s \geq 4m_\pi^2$ they describe the fusion process, and for $s \leq 0$ they describe the Compton process. In terms of (229), the neutral pion polarisabilities read [49]

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha^0_\pi = & \quad +\frac{\alpha}{2m_\pi}\Big(A^0(0, m_\pi^2, m_\pi^2) + 16m_\pi^2 B^0(0, m_\pi^2, m_\pi^2)\Big) \\ \beta^0_\pi = & \quad -\frac{\alpha}{2m_\pi}A^0(0, m_\pi^2, m_\pi^2)\end{aligned} \qquad (230)$$

with $\alpha = e^2/4\pi = 1/137$. The charged pion polarisabilities follow from (230) by exchanging the upper script $0 \to \pm$, and multiplying the overall result by a minus sign. From (218-221) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_\pi = & \quad -\frac{\alpha m_\pi}{2}\lim_{s\to 0}\lim_{t\to m_\pi^2}\frac{1}{s^2}\Big(V(s,t,u) + \frac{24}{\epsilon_1\cdot\epsilon_2}\hat{V}(s,t,u)\Big) \\ \beta_\pi = & \quad +\frac{\alpha m_\pi}{2}\lim_{s\to 0}\lim_{t\to m_\pi^2}\frac{1}{s^2}V(s,t,u)\end{aligned} \qquad (231)$$

with

$$V = V^{33\mu}_\mu \qquad \text{and} \qquad \hat{V} = \epsilon_1^\mu\epsilon_2^\nu V^{33}_{\mu\nu} \qquad : \gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\pi^0$$

$$V = V^{11\mu}_\mu \qquad \text{and} \qquad \hat{V} = \epsilon_1^\mu\epsilon_2^\nu V^{11}_{\mu\nu} \qquad : \gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} V^{ab}_{\mu\nu} = \quad & +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}k_1^\alpha k_2^\beta \int d^4y d^4z_1 d^4z_2 e^{-iq_1\cdot y+ik_1\cdot z_1+ik_2\cdot z_2} \\ & \times < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\mathbf{V}^3_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^3_\nu(0)\Big)|0 > \\ & -\frac{i}{f_\pi}m_\pi^2\delta^{ab}\int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y-iq_2\cdot z} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^3_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^3_\nu(z)\hat{\sigma}(0)\Big)|0 > \end{aligned} \tag{232}$$

The relation between A, B in (230) and $V, \hat{V}$ in (231) is straightforward. An assessment of the pion polarisabilities in $SU(2)\times SU(2)$ will be given below using a new one-loop effective action as we now discuss.

18. One-Loop Effective Action

To give a quantitative estimate for the unknown terms in $\pi\pi\to\pi\pi$ (199-200), $\pi\to e\nu\gamma$ (207), $\pi\to e\nu\gamma^*$ (205), $\gamma\gamma\to\pi\pi$ (219-221) and $\gamma\pi\to\gamma\pi$ (223-226), we will expand the exact results of the preceding section in $1/f_\pi$. For that we will need power counting. We recall that for the gauged nonlinear sigma model,

$$\hat{\mathbf{I}} = f_\pi^2 m_\pi^2 \int d^4x + \int d^4x\ \pi(x)\cdot J(x) + \mathbf{I}_Q + \mathcal{O}(\pi^3/f_\pi) \tag{233}$$

where the quadratic action $\mathbf{I}_Q$ has been defined in (87). If we count $\phi = (v, a, s, J)$ as order f_π^0, then $\pi\sim f_\pi^0$, so that $\mathbf{j}_{V\mu}\sim f_\pi^0$, and $\mathbf{j}^a_{A\mu}\sim f_\pi^0$, whereas $\hat{\sigma}\sim f_\pi^{-1}$. We will *assume* that the same is true for QCD (or more appropriately the real world). As a check, we note that this assumption is consistent with (161-162) for the q-number piece, while $< 0|\hat{\sigma}|0 >\sim f_\pi^{-1}$ reproduces the Gell-Mann-Oakes-Renner (GOR) relation

$$\hat{m} < 0|\overline{q}q|0 >= -m_\pi^2 f_\pi^2 + \mathcal{O}(1) \tag{234}$$

by (64-77).

To leading order, the master formulas are then the strong version of (53) and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0}{\delta J} = \quad & i\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0\Big(1+G_R\mathbf{K}\Big)\pi_{\rm in} - iG_R J\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0 \\ = \quad & i\Big(1+G_A\mathbf{K}\Big)\pi_{\rm in}\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0 - iG_A J\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0. \end{aligned} \tag{235}$$

The pionic part of the S-matrix to this order $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0$ is completely fixed by (53) and (235) up to a phase factor which may depend on the external fields. The phase factor may be determined from the vacuum persistence amplitude

$$\begin{aligned} e^{iZ_0[v,a,s,J]} \equiv & \quad < 0 \text{ in}|\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0|0 \text{ in} > \\ = & \quad \int [d\pi] \exp\Big(i\mathbf{I}_Q + i\int d^4x \pi(x)\cdot J(x)\Big) \\ = & \quad e^{iZ_0[v,a,s,0]} \ \exp\Big(-i\frac{1}{2}\int d^4xd^4y J^a(x) G_F^{ab}(x,y) J^b(y)\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{236}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} Z_0[v,a,s,0] = & \quad -i \ \ln\Big(\frac{\det(-\Box - m_\pi^2 + i0)}{\det(-\Box - m_\pi^2 - \mathbf{K} + i0)}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ = & \quad +\frac{i}{2}\text{Trln}\Big(1 - \mathbf{K}\Delta_F\Big) = -\frac{i}{2}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n}\text{Tr}(\mathbf{K}\Delta_F)^n \end{aligned} \tag{237}$$

where G_F is the Green's function

$$\Big(- \nabla^\mu \nabla_\mu + \underline{a}^\mu \underline{a}_\mu - m_\pi^2 - s\Big) G_F(x,y) = \delta^4(x-y)\mathbf{1} \tag{238}$$

with Steuckelberg-Feynman boundary conditions.

Equations (236-237) imply that $Z_0[v,a,s,J]$ gives the Green's functions of $\mathbf{j}^a_{V\mu}$, $\mathbf{j}^a_{A\mu}$, and $\hat{\sigma}$ to one-loop, while Green's functions involving π are given to tree level. This is awkward, but since Green's functions for π may be expressed in terms of $\mathbf{j}^a_{V\mu}$, $\mathbf{j}^a_{A\mu}$, and $\hat{\sigma}$ as in section 4, this is not a fundamental difficulty. $Z_0[v,a,s,0]$ is then the desired one-loop effective action.

In (236-237) s and a^a_μ appear only in the combination $\hat{s} = s\mathbf{1} - \underline{a}_\mu \underline{a}^\mu$. We assume the same is true after renormalization. A general analysis without this assumption is given in Appendix E. With this in mind, we note that local isospin invariance

$$\mathbf{X}_V Z_0[v,a,s,0] = 0 \tag{239}$$

implies that the sum of graphs with external v-legs only is fixed up to one constant

$$-\frac{c_1}{4}\int d^4x \ v_{\mu\nu}(x)\cdot v^{\mu\nu}(x) \tag{240}$$

where $v_{\mu\nu}$ is the field strength

$$\underline{v}_{\mu\nu} = \Big[\nabla_\mu, \nabla_\nu\Big] = \partial_\mu \underline{v}_\nu - \partial_\nu \underline{v}_\mu + [\underline{v}_\mu, \underline{v}_\nu]. \tag{241}$$

For mixed $v - \hat{s}$ graphs, Fig. 6a is proportional to Tr $\underline{v}_\mu(x)\hat{s}(y) = 0$, whereas the divergences in Fig. 6b and Fig. 6c cancel. This corresponds to the fact that there are no contact terms which obey (239) and have the correct index structure. For the remaining graphs, the possible tadpole of Fig. 6d is eliminated by (112-113), whereas Fig. 6e gives another constant

$$\frac{\hat{c}_1}{4}\int d^4x\ \mathrm{Tr}\Big(\hat{s}(x)\hat{s}(x)\Big)\ . \tag{242}$$

The consistency of the above assumptions may be checked in *several* ways as we now discuss.

18.1. Gell-Mann-Oakes-Renner (GOR)

First, we note that $<0|\hat{\sigma}|0>=0$ to one loop is compatible with chiral perturbation theory to one loop. Indeed, using the notation of Gasser and Leutwyler [8] we have [53]

$$\hat{m}<0|\overline{u}u|0>=\hat{m}<0|\overline{u}u|0>_0\Big(1-\frac{3M_\pi^2}{32\pi^2F_\pi^2}\ \mathrm{ln}M_\pi^2\Big)=-\frac{1}{2}F^2M^2\Big(1-\frac{3M_\pi^2}{32\pi^2F_\pi^2}\ \mathrm{ln}M_\pi^2\Big) \tag{243}$$

with [54]

$$M_\pi^2=M^2\Big(1+\frac{M^2}{32\pi^2F^2}\mathrm{ln}M^2+...\Big) \tag{244}$$

$$F_\pi=F\Big(1-\frac{M^2}{16\pi^2F^2}\mathrm{ln}M^2+...\Big). \tag{245}$$

The chiral logarithms are seen to cancel, leaving to one-loop

$$\hat{m}<0|\overline{u}u|0>=-\frac{1}{2}F_\pi^2M_\pi^2 \tag{246}$$

which is the GOR relation. At this stage, we should mention that alternatives to the GOR relation have been advocated by some authors [55]. A way to distinguish between these various schemes is to increase the accuracy of the S-wave $\pi\pi$ scattering lengths, or to improve on the empirical analysis of $\pi\rightarrow e\nu\gamma$, $\pi\rightarrow e\nu\gamma^*$, $\gamma\gamma\rightarrow\pi\pi$ or $\gamma\pi\rightarrow\gamma\pi$ at threshold. We note that the GOR relation cannot be tested in pion-nucleon or in photon-nucleon processes (to leading order in the charge) since $<0|\hat{\sigma}|0>$ drops out from the connected part of the pertinent amplitudes.

18.2. KSFR-Relation

The vanishing of the three point function $< 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(x)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y)\mathbf{V}^c_\gamma(z)\Big)|0 >$, as well as $< 0|\hat{\sigma}|0 >$ to one loop gives

$$\mathbf{F}_V(q^2) = 1 + \frac{q^2}{2f_\pi^2}\Pi_V(q^2) + \mathcal{O}\Big(\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}\Big) \tag{247}$$

by (190-191). For space-like momenta $q^2 < 0$, the vector form-factor of the pion $\mathbf{F}_V(q^2)$ and the vector-isovector correlator $\mathbf{\Pi}_V(q^2)$ may be parameterized as

$$\mathbf{F}_V(q^2) = \frac{-m_\rho^2}{q^2 - m_\rho^2 + i0} \tag{248}$$

$$\mathbf{\Pi}_V(q^2) = -f_\rho^2\frac{1}{q^2 - m_\rho^2 + i0} \tag{249}$$

where

$$< 0|\mathbf{V}^a_\mu(x)|\rho^b(p) >= \delta^{ab}\epsilon_\mu(p)f_\rho m_\rho e^{-ip\cdot x}. \tag{250}$$

The result (247) then implies

$$1 = \frac{f_\rho^2}{2f_\pi^2} + \mathcal{O}\Big(\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}\Big) \tag{251}$$

which is essentially the KSFR relation [56]. With $f_\pi = 93$ MeV and $f_\rho = 144$ MeV, we find

$$1 = 1.20 + \mathcal{O}\Big(\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}\Big). \tag{252}$$

The 20% discrepancy is somewhat large and may be due to the finite width of the ρ as well as the strong presence of the ρ' resonance in $\Pi_V(q^2)$.

To bring the above result to a more conventional form, we may introduce the transition amplitude $i\mathcal{T}$ for the $\rho^c(p) \to \pi^a(k)\pi^b(q)$ decay. By the mass-shell conditions $k^2 = q^2 = m_\pi^2$, $p^2 = m_\rho^2$, and energy-momentum conservation $p = k + q$, all inner products of the four vectors p, k, q are fixed. Isospin invariance implies that $i\mathcal{T}$ is proportional to ϵ^{abc}, so it is antisymmetric under $k \leftrightarrow q$ by Bose statistics. Since the amplitude is linear in the polarization vector $\epsilon_\mu(q)$ of the ρ, it follows that

$$i\mathcal{T}\Big(\pi^a(k)\pi^b(q) \leftarrow \rho^c(p)\Big) = g_{\rho\pi\pi}\epsilon^{abc}(k-q)\cdot\epsilon(p) \tag{253}$$

which defines the $\rho\pi\pi$ coupling constant $g_{\rho\pi\pi}$. By (250) $\mathbf{V}^a_\mu/m_\rho f_\rho$ may be used as an interpolating field for the the ρ. The WLSZ reduction formula and current conservation imply

$$\begin{aligned}&< 0|a^a_{\rm in}(k)a^b_{\rm in}(q)\mathbf{S}\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)|0 >= \\ &f_\rho m_\rho g_{\rho\pi\pi} i\epsilon^{acb}(k-q)_\mu \frac{1}{(k+q)^2-m_\rho^2+i0}e^{i(k+q)\cdot y} + ... \, .\end{aligned} \tag{254}$$

Comparison with the crossed version of (169) and (248) yields

$$f_\rho g_{\rho\pi\pi} = -m_\rho . \tag{255}$$

Hence (251) is equivalent to

$$m_\rho^2 = 2g^2_{\rho\pi\pi}f_\pi^2 + \mathcal{O}\Big(\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\Big) \tag{256}$$

which is the conventional form of the KSFR relation.

18.3. On-Shell Radiative Decay : $\pi \to e\nu\gamma$

A third consequence of our assignment is that the one-loop contribution to the radiative decay of the pion $\pi \to e\nu\gamma$ vanishes. It follows that to the same order the structure dependent axial-vector form factor vanishes. To see this consider the uncontracted amplitude (206) with $a = 3$

$$\mathcal{T}^{bc}_{\nu\mu}(p,q) = \int d^4x e^{iq\cdot x} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^3_\mu(x)\mathbf{A}^b_\nu(0)\Big)a^{c\dagger}_{\rm in}(p)|0 > \tag{257}$$

Covariance, implies the general decomposition

$$\mathcal{T}^{bc}_{\nu\mu}(p,q) = \epsilon^{3bc}\Big(A(\nu)g_{\mu\nu} + B(\nu)q_\nu p_\mu + C(\nu)q_\nu q_\mu + D(\nu)q_\mu p_\nu + E(\nu)p_\nu p_\mu\Big) \tag{258}$$

with $\nu = p\cdot q$, $p^2 = m_\pi^2$ and $q^2 = 0$. The structure dependent form factors $A, B, ..., E$ are constrained by gauge invariance $q^\mu \mathcal{T}^{bc}_{\nu\mu} = 0$. Because of the Adler theorem, there is no pion-pole contribution to A. The non-pole contribution to (257) follows from (207) in the form

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\mathcal{T}}^{bc}_{\nu\mu}(p,q) = \quad & +\epsilon^{3bc}g_{\mu\nu}\Big(f_\pi - <\hat\sigma>\Big) \\ & +\epsilon^{3dc}\frac{i}{f_\pi}\int d^4y e^{-ik\cdot y} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^d_{A\mu}(y)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\nu}(0)\Big)|0 > \\ & -\frac{i}{f_\pi}p^\gamma \int d^4x d^4z e^{iq\cdot x - ip\cdot z} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^3_\mu(x)\mathbf{j}^c_{A\gamma}(z)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(0)\Big)|0 >\end{aligned} \tag{259}$$

Setting

$$i\int d^4y e^{-ik\cdot y} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^d_{A\mu}(y)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\nu}(0)\Big)|0 >= \delta^{bd}(-g_{\mu\nu}k^2 + k_\mu k_\nu)\mathbf{\Pi}_A(k^2) \tag{260}$$

with $k = p - q$, and using (258-260) we obtain

$$A(\nu) = f_\pi - < \hat{\sigma} > - \frac{k^2}{f_\pi}\mathbf{\Pi}_A(k^2) \tag{261}$$

Empirically, the axial structure function (261) is fitted to $A(\nu) = f_\pi - \nu a(\nu)$ with finite $a(0)$. This implies first that

$$\frac{< \hat{\sigma} >}{f_\pi} = -\frac{m_\pi^2}{f_\pi^2}\mathbf{\Pi}_A(m_\pi^2) \sim -\frac{m_\pi^2}{m_A^2} \sim -0.01 \tag{262}$$

suggesting a 1 % deviation from the GOR result, and second that

$$a(0) = -\frac{2}{f_\pi}\mathbf{\Pi}_A(0) \tag{263}$$

in agreement with the result derived by Terentev using the soft pion limit [48]. Since to one-loop the one-pion subtracted correlator (260) does not acquire a transverse part, we conclude that to the same order the structure dependent axial-vector form factor vanishes, *i.e.* $a(0) = 0$.

We note that ρ Vector Meson Dominance (VMD) as implied by our counting rules, does not necessarily mean a_1 VMD. Indeed, we can write down effective lagrangians which realize chiral symmetry by $\rho \rightarrow \rho\pi$ rather than $\rho \rightarrow a_1$. Consistency with the chiral counting arguments presented above implies that the a_1 will only appear at two-loops or higher since $a_1 \sim 3\pi$. In this way, we think that the chiral duality arguments as used in chiral perturbation theory [40] should only make use of the rho effects to one-loop for consistency. This is more so since the axial-vector correlation function does not generate a transverse part to one-loop.

We also note that in the soft pion limit, the structure-dependent axial form factor obeys the Das-Mathur-Okubo theorem [57]

$$a(0) = \frac{1}{f_\pi}\int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s}\Big(\rho_A(s) - \rho_V(s)\Big) + \frac{1}{3}f_\pi < r^2 >_V \tag{264}$$

where $< r^2 >_V = 6\mathbf{F}'_V(0)$ is the pion-isovector charge radius. The spectral densities in (264) are understood in the chiral limit. They are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_V(s) &= \frac{1}{\pi}\mathrm{Im}\Pi_V(s)\\ \rho_A(s) &= \frac{1}{\pi}\mathrm{Im}\Pi_A(s)\end{aligned} \tag{265}$$

Using resonance saturation in the zero width approximation

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_V(s) &= f_\rho^2\delta(s-m_\rho^2)\\ \rho_A(s) &= f_A^2\delta(s-m_A^2)\end{aligned}\tag{266}$$

along with the two Weinberg sum rules [3]

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\infty ds\Big(\rho_V(s)-\rho_A(s)\Big) &= \qquad f_\pi^2+\mathcal{O}(m_\pi^2)\\ \int_0^\infty ds\ s\Big(\rho_V(s)-\rho_A(s)\Big) &= \qquad \mathcal{O}(m_{\pi^2})\end{aligned}\tag{267}$$

that is $m_A^2=2m_\rho^2$ and $f_A^2=f_\pi^2$ respectively, and the KSFR relation $f_\rho^2=2f_\pi^2$, we have

$$f_\pi a(0)=\Big(\frac{f_A^2}{m_A^2}-\frac{f_\rho^2}{m_\rho^2}\Big)+\frac{1}{3}f_\pi^2<r^2>_V=\frac{f_A^2}{m_A^2}\tag{268}$$

We have used $<r^2>_V=6/m_\rho^2$ in the VDM limit (see below). This clearly shows that if the axial spectral density is set to zero at one-loop as it should, then $a(0)=0$ in agreement with (263).

Dominguez and Sola [58] have estimated $a(\nu=0)$ using (264), duality and the empirical vector and axial spectral functions as measured from semileptonic decays $\tau\rightarrow\nu_\tau+n\pi$ with $n=$ *even* (vector) and $n=$ *odd* (axial) up to the kinematical phase space limit $t\sim 3$ GeV^2. Using $<r^2>_V=0.44\pm0.03$ fm^2, they have found $2f_\pi a(0)=0.017\pm0.001\pm0.004$. Since the a_1 contributes empirically to the isovector-axial correlator, this result provides an upper bound to ours. Finally, the ratio $\gamma=a(\nu=0)/F(\nu=0)$ of the structure dependent axial-form factor to the structure-dependent vector form factor has been measured, with $F(\nu=0)=0.0265$ following from $\pi^0\rightarrow\gamma\gamma$ decay [42]. Two values of γ have been reported : $\gamma=0.44\pm0.12$ and $\gamma=-2.36\pm0.12$ [42]. Our one-loop result $\gamma=0$ is incompatible with the second result. The possible relationship between this result and the charged pion polarisability will be discussed below.

18.4. Off-Shell Radiative Decay : $\pi\rightarrow e\nu\gamma^*$

A fourth consequence of our assumption is that the off-shell radiative decay described by (205) simplifies to

$$-\frac{i}{f_\pi}\epsilon^{abc}\Big(g_\nu^\beta-\frac{k_\nu k^\beta}{k^2-m_\pi^2}\Big)\Big(-g_{\mu\beta}q^2+q_\mu q_\beta\Big)\ \Pi_V(q^2)\tag{269}$$

and indeed vanishes for $q^2 = 0$. This result is related to the second axial-vector structure form factor R as measured at SIN [59]. From (269) we have $R = \sqrt{2} m_\pi \Pi_V(0)/f_\pi$. Using $\Pi_V(0) = 2f_\pi^2 F_V'(0)$ with $F_V'(0) =< r^2 >_V /6$, we have $R = \sqrt{2} m_\pi f_\pi < r^2 >_V /3$. With the empirical value for the isovector radius of the pion quoted above, we obtain $R = 0.069 \pm 0.005$ in very good agreement with $R(\exp) = 0.06 \pm 0.02$ as measured at SIN [59]. Our result agrees with the soft pion result [60].

18.5. Pion-Pion Scattering : $\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$

A fifth consequence of our assumption is the structure of the $\pi\pi$ scattering amplitude. With our assignments, the one-loop contribution to (200) is contained entirely in

$$Z_0 \rightarrow \frac{1}{4} \int d^4x d^4y \mathrm{Tr}\Big(\hat{s}(x)\hat{s}(y)\Big) \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4} e^{-iq\cdot(x-y)} \Big(\hat{c}_1 + \mathcal{J}(q^2)\Big) \tag{270}$$

where

$$\mathcal{J}(q^2) = \quad -i \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} \Big(\frac{1}{k^2 - m_\pi^2 + i0} \frac{1}{(k-q)^2 - m_\pi^2 + i0} - (q = p = 0) \Big) \tag{271}$$

From Appendix F, we have ($q^2 \geq 4m_\pi^2$)

$$16\pi^2 \mathcal{J}(q^2) = 2 + \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m_\pi^2}{q^2}} \left(\ln\Big(\frac{\sqrt{1 - 4m_\pi^2/q^2} - 1}{\sqrt{1 - 4m_\pi^2/q^2} + 1} \Big) + i\pi \right) \tag{272}$$

The factor $1/16\pi^2$ is worth some comment, since it suggests that the expansion parameter is $q^2/16\pi^2 f_\pi^2 \sim q^2/1\mathrm{GeV}^2$ [61], rather than $q^2/f_\pi^2 \sim q^2/0.01\mathrm{GeV}^2$, which differs by a factor of 100.

It follows from (270) that

$$< 0|T^*\Big(\hat{\sigma}(x)\hat{\sigma}(y)\Big)|0 >_{\mathrm{conn}} = -\frac{3i}{2f_\pi^2} \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4} e^{-iq\cdot(x-y)} \Big(\hat{c}_1 + \mathcal{J}(q^2)\Big) \tag{273}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &< 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{A\alpha}^a(y_1)\mathbf{j}_{A\beta}^b(y_2)\hat{\sigma}(y_3)\Big)|0 >_{\mathrm{conn}} = \\ &-\frac{2}{f_\pi} g_{\alpha\beta}\delta^{ab}\delta^4(y_1 - y_2) \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4} e^{-iq\cdot(y_1-y_3)} \Big(\hat{c}_1 + \mathcal{J}(q^2)\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{274}$$

$$\begin{aligned} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}_{A\alpha}^a(y_1)\mathbf{j}_{A\beta}^b(y_2)\mathbf{j}_{A\gamma}^c(y_3)\mathbf{j}_{A\delta}^d(y_4)\Big)|0 >_{\mathrm{conn}} &= i\Big(2\delta^{ab}\delta^{cd} + \delta^{ac}\delta^{bd} + \delta^{ad}\delta^{bc}\Big) g_{\alpha\beta} g_{\gamma\delta} \\ \times \delta^4(y_1 - y_2)\delta^4(y_3 - y_4) \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4} e^{-iq\cdot(y_1-y_3)} &\Big(\hat{c}_1 + \mathcal{J}(q^2)\Big) + 2 \text{ perm.} \end{aligned} \tag{275}$$

$$\mathbf{F}_S(t) + \frac{1}{f_\pi} = -\frac{1}{f_\pi^3}\Big(t - \frac{m_\pi^2}{2}\Big)\Big(\hat{c}_1 + \mathcal{J}(t)\Big) \tag{276}$$

$$\begin{aligned} i\mathcal{T}_{\rm rest} = \quad & +\Big(\frac{i}{f_\pi^4} m_\pi^2 \delta^{ab}\delta^{cd}\Big(2t - \frac{5}{2}m_\pi^2\Big)\Big(\hat{c}_1 + \mathcal{J}(t)\Big) \\ & \quad + \frac{i}{4f_\pi^4}\Big(2\delta^{ab}\delta^{cd} + \delta^{ac}\delta^{bd} + \delta^{ab}\delta^{bc}\Big)(t - 2m_\pi^2)^2\Big(\hat{c}_1 + \mathcal{J}(t)\Big)\Big) \\ & +2 \text{ perm.} + \mathcal{O}\Big(\frac{1}{f_\pi^6}\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{277}$$

to one loop. As a check, let us introduce the amplitude $A(s,t,u)$

$$i\mathcal{T} = i\delta^{ac}\delta^{bd}A(s,t,u) + i\delta^{ab}\delta^{cd}A(t,u,s) + i\delta^{ad}\delta^{bc}A(u,t,s) \tag{278}$$

so that

$$A_{\rm tree}(s,t,u) = \frac{1}{f_\pi^2}(s - m_\pi^2) \tag{279}$$

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\rm rho}(s,t,u) = \quad & +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}(s-u)\Big(\mathbf{F}_V(t) - 1 - \frac{t}{4f_\pi^2}\mathbf{\Pi}_V(t)\Big) \\ & +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}(s-t)\Big(\mathbf{F}_V(u) - 1 - \frac{u}{4f_\pi^2}\mathbf{\Pi}_V(u)\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{280}$$

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\rm rest}(s,t,u) = \quad & +\frac{1}{2f_\pi^4}(s^2 - m_\pi^4)\Big(\hat{c}_1 + \mathcal{J}(s)\Big) + \frac{1}{4f_\pi^4}(t - 2m_\pi^2)^2\Big(\hat{c}_1 + \mathcal{J}(t)\Big) \\ & +\frac{1}{4f_\pi^4}(u - 2m_\pi^2)^2\Big(\hat{c}_1 + \mathcal{J}(u)\Big) + \mathcal{O}\Big(\frac{1}{f_\pi^6}\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{281}$$

To one loop

$$\mathbf{\Pi}_V(q^2) = c_1 + \frac{1}{72\pi^2} + \frac{1}{3}\Big(1 - \frac{4m_\pi^2}{q^2}\Big)\mathcal{J}(q^2) \tag{282}$$

where we have adopted the convention that $c_1 = \hat{c}_1 = 0$ with the BPHZ subtraction scheme. Then

$$\mathbf{F}_V(q^2) = 1 + \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2}\Big(c_1 q^2 + \frac{q^2}{72\pi^2} + \frac{1}{3}\Big(q^2 - 4m_\pi^2\Big)\mathcal{J}(q^2)\Big) \tag{283}$$

by (247). It follows that

$$A_{\rm rho}(s,t,u) + A_{\rm rest}(s,t,u) = B(s,t,u) + C(s,t,u) \tag{284}$$

to one loop, where

$$\begin{aligned}
B(s,t,u) = \quad & +\frac{1}{2f_\pi^4}(s^2-m_\pi^4)\mathcal{J}(s) \\
& +\frac{1}{6f_\pi^4}\Big(t(t-u)-2m_\pi^2 t+4m_\pi^2 u-2m_\pi^4\Big)\mathcal{J}(t) \\
& +\frac{1}{6f_\pi^4}\Big(u(u-t)-2m_\pi^2 u+4m_\pi^2 t-2m_\pi^4\Big)\mathcal{J}(u)
\end{aligned} \tag{285}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
C(s,t,u) = \quad & +\frac{1}{4f_\pi^4}\Big(c_1+\frac{1}{72\pi^2}\Big)\Big((s-u)t+(s-t)u\Big) \\
& +\frac{1}{2f_\pi^4}\hat{c}_1(s^2-m_\pi^4)+\frac{1}{4f_\pi^4}\hat{c}_1\Big((t-2m_\pi^2)^2+(u-2m_\pi^2)^2\Big) \\
= \quad & -\frac{1}{2f_\pi^4}\Big(c_1+\frac{1}{72\pi^2}\Big)(s-2m_\pi^2)^2+\frac{1}{2f_\pi^4}\hat{c}_1(s^2-m_\pi^4) \\
& +\frac{1}{8f_\pi^4}\Big(c_1+\frac{1}{72\pi^2}+\hat{c}_1\Big)\Big((t-2m_\pi^2)^2+(u-2m_\pi^2)^2\Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{286}$$

The structure of $B(s,t,u)$ is dictated by unitarity and is in agreement with previous analyses by various authors.

Amplitudes with fixed isospin I in the s channel are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
T^0(s,t) &= 3A(s,t,u)+A(t,u,s)+A(u,s,t) \\
T^1(s,t) &= A(t,u,s)-A(u,s,t) \\
T^2(s,t) &= A(t,u,s)+A(u,s,t).
\end{aligned} \tag{287}$$

In the region of elastic unitarity $4m_\pi^2 < s < 16m_\pi^2$, $T^I(s,t)$ can be expressed in terms of phase shifts $\delta_l^I(s)$ as

$$T^I(s,t) = 32\pi\sum_{l=0}^{\infty}(2l+1)P_l(\mathrm{cos}\theta)\Big(1+\frac{m_\pi^2}{Q^2}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\; e^{i\delta_l^I(s)}\mathrm{sin}(\delta_l^I(s)) \tag{288}$$

where $P_l(\mathrm{cos}\theta)$ are the Legendre polynomials, θ is the scattering angle, and Q is the momentum in the center of mass frame

$$\begin{aligned}
s &= +4(Q^2+m_\pi^2) \\
t &= -2Q^2(1-\mathrm{cos}\theta) \\
u &= -2Q^2(1+\mathrm{cos}\theta).
\end{aligned} \tag{289}$$

Bose symmetry implies that the $I = 0, 2$ channels contain only even l, while the $I = 1$ channel contains only odd l.

The phase shifts at threshold are parameterized as follows

$$\left(1+\frac{m_\pi^2}{Q^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\ \mathrm{Re}\Big(e^{i\delta_l^I(s)}\sin(\delta_l^I(s))\Big) = Q^{2l}\Big(a_l^I + b_l^I Q^2 + \mathcal{O}(Q^4)\Big). \tag{290}$$

We will refer to the a's as the scattering lengths, and b's as the range parameters. It follows that the tree term (279) contributes only to S and P waves,

$$\begin{aligned}
a_0^0(\text{tree}) &= +\frac{7m_\pi^2}{32\pi f_\pi^2} = +0.16\\
b_0^0(\text{tree}) &= +\frac{1}{4\pi f_\pi^2} = +0.18\ m_\pi^{-2}\\
a_1^1(\text{tree}) &= +\frac{1}{24\pi f_\pi^2} = +0.030\ m_\pi^{-2}\\
a_0^2(\text{tree}) &= -\frac{m_\pi^2}{16\pi f_\pi^2} = -0.045\\
b_0^2(\text{tree}) &= -\frac{1}{8\pi f_\pi^2} = -0.089\ m_\pi^{-2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{291}$$

Experimentally, the phase shifts $\delta_l^I(s)$ are measurable from the final state interaction in $K^- \to \pi^+\pi^- e^- \overline{\nu}$ decay and also from $\pi p \to \pi\pi p$ (see above) as well as $\pi p \to \pi\pi\Delta$ decays by extrapolation to the pion pole in the t-channel. The results are [62]

$$\begin{aligned}
a_0^0(\text{exp}) &= 0.26 \pm 0.05\\
b_0^0(\text{exp}) &= (0.25 \pm 0.03)\ m_\pi^{-2}\\
a_1^1(\text{exp}) &= (0.038 \pm 0.002)\ m_\pi^{-2}\\
(2a_0^0 - 5a_0^2)(\text{exp}) &= 0.614 \pm 0.0028\\
b_0^2(\text{exp}) &= (-0.082 \pm 0.008)\ m_\pi^{-2}\\
a_2^0(\text{exp}) &= (17 \pm 3)10^{-4}\ m_\pi^{-4}\\
a_2^2(\text{exp}) &= (1.3 \pm 3)10^{-4}\ m_\pi^{-4}.
\end{aligned} \tag{292}$$

where m_π is taken to be the charged pion mass 139.6 MeV. The tree level predictions are rather off, for instance 40% for a_0^0. This means that the role of the scalar correlation function following from (200) may be important. This point is presently under investigation [63].

For the ρ contribution the expressions (248-249) are appropriate for $q^2 = t$ or u, but not for $q^2 = s$, since they do not have the proper threshold behavior. This point may be corrected. Since we are working only to one-loop, we may simply use (282-283), so that

$$A_{\rm rho}(s,t,u) = \frac{1}{4f_\pi^4}(s-u)t\mathbf{\Pi}_V(t) + \frac{1}{4f_\pi^4}(s-t)u\mathbf{\Pi}_V(u). \tag{293}$$

The necessary parameter is then $c_1 = \mathbf{\Pi}_V(0) = f_\rho^2/m_\rho^2 = 0.035$. Alternativaly, we may take $c_1 = 2f_\pi^2\mathbf{F}'_V(0) = 0.033 \pm 0.002$ where we have used $< r^2 >_V = 6\mathbf{F}'_V(0) = 0.439 \pm 0.03$ fm^2. For definiteness we choose the former. Expanding in Q gives

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\rm rho}(s,t,u) = & \; +\frac{1}{4f_\pi^4}(s-u)t\mathbf{\Pi}_V(0) + \frac{1}{4f_\pi^4}(s-t)u\mathbf{\Pi}_V(0) \\ & +\frac{1}{4f_\pi^4}4m_\pi^2\mathbf{\Pi}'_V(0)t^2 + \frac{1}{4f_\pi^4}4m_\pi^2\mathbf{\Pi}'_V(0)u^2 + \mathcal{O}(Q^6) \\ = & \; +\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}\frac{f_\rho^2}{m_\rho^2}\Big(-6Q^4 + 2Q^4\cos^2\theta - 4m_\pi^2Q^2\Big) \\ & +\frac{1}{60\pi^2 f_\pi^4}Q^4(1+\cos^2\theta) + \mathcal{O}(Q^6) \end{aligned} \tag{294}$$

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\rm rho}(t,u,s) = & \; +\frac{1}{4f_\pi^4}(t-u)s\mathbf{\Pi}_V(4m_\pi^2) + \frac{1}{4f_\pi^4}4m_\pi^2\mathbf{\Pi}'_V(4m_\pi^2)(s-4m_\pi^2)(t-u) \\ & +\frac{1}{4f_\pi^4}u(t-s)\mathbf{\Pi}_V(0) + \frac{1}{4f_\pi^4}u^2(-4m_\pi^2)\mathbf{\Pi}'_V(0) + \mathcal{O}(Q^6) \\ = & \; +\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}\frac{f_\rho^2}{m_\rho^2}\Big(+3Q^4 + 6Q^4\cos\theta - Q^4\cos^2\theta + 2m_\pi^2Q^2 + 6m_\pi^2Q^2\cos\theta\Big) \\ & +\frac{1}{18\pi^2 f_\pi^4}(Q^4 + m_\pi^2Q^2)\cos\theta + \frac{1}{6\pi^2 f_\pi^4}Q^4\cos\theta \\ & -\frac{1}{120\pi^2 f_\pi^4}Q^4(1+\cos\theta)^2 + \mathcal{O}(Q^6) \end{aligned} \tag{295}$$

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\rm rho}(u,t,s) = & \; +\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}\frac{f_\rho^2}{m_\rho^2}\Big(+3Q^4 - 6Q^4\cos\theta - Q^4\cos^2\theta + 2m_\pi^2Q^2 - 6m_\pi^2Q^2\cos\theta\Big) \\ & -\frac{1}{18\pi^2 f_\pi^4}(Q^4 + m_\pi^2Q^2)\cos\theta - \frac{1}{6\pi^2 f_\pi^4}Q^4\cos\theta \\ & +\frac{1}{120\pi^2 f_\pi^4}Q^4(1-\cos\theta)^2 + \mathcal{O}(Q^6). \end{aligned} \tag{296}$$

Therefore, the ρ contribution to the scattering lengths is given by

$$a_0^0(\mathrm{rho}) = 0$$

$$\begin{aligned}
b_0^0(\mathrm{rho}) &= -\frac{m_\pi^2}{4\pi f_\pi^4}\frac{f_\rho^2}{m_\rho^2} = -0.014\, m_\pi^{-2} \\
a_2^0(\mathrm{rho}) &= +\frac{1}{60\pi f_\pi^4}\frac{f_\rho^2}{m_\rho^2} + \frac{1}{7200\pi^3 f_\pi^4} = +9.3\ 10^{-4}\, m_\pi^{-4} \\
a_1^1(\mathrm{rho}) &= +\frac{m_\pi^2}{8\pi f_\pi^4}\frac{f_\rho^2}{m_\rho^2} + \frac{m_\pi^2}{864\pi^3 f_\pi^4} = +0.0070\, m_\pi^{-2} \\
a_0^2(\mathrm{rho}) &= 0 \\
b_0^2(\mathrm{rho}) &= +\frac{m_\pi^2}{8\pi f_\pi^4}\frac{f_\rho^2}{m_\rho^2} = +0.0072\, m_\pi^{-2} \\
a_2^2(\mathrm{rho}) &= -\frac{1}{120\pi f_\pi^4}\frac{f_\rho^2}{m_\rho^2} - \frac{1}{14400\pi^3 f_\pi^4} = -4.7\ 10^{-4}\, m_\pi^{-4}
\end{aligned} \tag{297}$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Re}\Big(A_{\mathrm{rest}}(s,t,u)\Big) = \quad & +\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}Q^4\Big(\frac{32}{3}\hat{c}_1 - \frac{19}{40\pi^2}\Big) + \frac{1}{f_\pi^4}Q^4\Big(\cos^2\theta - \frac{1}{3}\Big)\Big(2\hat{c}_1 - \frac{3}{40\pi^2}\Big) \\
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}m_\pi^2 Q^2\Big(20\hat{c}_1 + \frac{49}{48\pi^2}\Big) + \frac{1}{f_\pi^4}m_\pi^4\Big(\frac{19}{2}\hat{c}_1 + \frac{15}{16\pi^2}\Big) + \mathcal{O}(Q^6)
\end{aligned} \tag{298}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Re}\Big(A_{\mathrm{rest}}(t,u,s)\Big) = \quad & +\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}Q^4\Big(8\hat{c}_1 + \frac{11}{360\pi^2}\Big) + \frac{1}{f_\pi^4}Q^4\cos\theta\Big(-2\hat{c}_1 - \frac{17}{240\pi^2}\Big) \\
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}Q^4\Big(\cos^2\theta - \frac{1}{3}\Big)\Big(3\hat{c}_1 - \frac{19}{480\pi^2}\Big) + \frac{1}{f_\pi^4}m_\pi^2 Q^2\Big(6\hat{c}_1 + \frac{35}{96\pi^2}\Big) \\
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}m_\pi^2 Q^2\cos\theta\Big(2\hat{c}_1 - \frac{1}{32\pi^2}\Big) + \frac{1}{f_\pi^4}m_\pi^4\Big(\frac{3}{2}\hat{c}_1 + \frac{1}{8\pi^2}\Big) + \mathcal{O}(Q^6)
\end{aligned} \tag{299}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Re}\Big(A_{\mathrm{rest}}(u,t,s)\Big) = \quad & +\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}Q^4\Big(8\hat{c}_1 + \frac{11}{360\pi^2}\Big) + \frac{1}{f_\pi^4}Q^4\cos\theta\Big(2\hat{c}_1 + \frac{17}{240\pi^2}\Big) \\
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}Q^4\Big(\cos^2\theta - \frac{1}{3}\Big)\Big(3\hat{c}_1 - \frac{19}{480\pi^2}\Big) + \frac{1}{f_\pi^4}m_\pi^2 Q^2\Big(6\hat{c}_1 + \frac{35}{96\pi^2}\Big) \\
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}m_\pi^2 Q^2\cos\theta\Big(-2\hat{c}_1 + \frac{1}{32\pi^2}\Big) + \frac{1}{f_\pi^4}m_\pi^4\Big(\frac{3}{2}\hat{c}_1 + \frac{1}{8\pi^2}\Big) + \mathcal{O}(Q^6)
\end{aligned} \tag{300}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
a_0^0(\mathrm{rest}) &= \frac{63 m_\pi^4}{64\pi f_\pi^4}\hat{c}_1 + \frac{49 m_\pi^4}{512\pi^3 f_\pi^4} \\
b_0^0(\mathrm{rest}) &= \frac{9 m_\pi^2}{4\pi f_\pi^4}\hat{c}_1 + \frac{91 m_\pi^2}{768\pi^3 f_\pi^4}
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
a_2^0(\mathrm{rest}) &= \frac{1}{20\pi f_\pi^4}\hat{c}_1 - \frac{73}{57600\pi^3 f_\pi^4} \\
a_1^1(\mathrm{rest}) &= \frac{m_\pi^2}{24\pi f_\pi^4}\hat{c}_1 - \frac{m_\pi^2}{1536\pi^3 f_\pi^4} \\
a_0^2(\mathrm{rest}) &= \frac{3m_\pi^4}{32\pi f_\pi^4}\hat{c}_1 + \frac{m_\pi^4}{128\pi^3 f_\pi^4} \\
b_0^2(\mathrm{rest}) &= \frac{3m_\pi^2}{8\pi f_\pi^4}\hat{c}_1 + \frac{35m_\pi^2}{1536\pi^3 f_\pi^4} \\
a_2^2(\mathrm{rest}) &= \frac{1}{40\pi f_\pi^4}\hat{c}_1 - \frac{19}{57600\pi^3 f_\pi^4}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{301}
$$

It follows that $\hat{c}_1$ can be determined in seven ways

$$
\begin{aligned}
16\pi^2\hat{c}_1 &= 16\pi^2\frac{64\pi f_\pi^4}{63m_\pi^4}\Big(a_0^0(\exp) - a_0^0(\mathrm{tree})\Big) - \frac{14}{9} = 8 \pm 5 \\
16\pi^2\hat{c}_1 &= 16\pi^2\frac{4\pi f_\pi^4}{9m_\pi^2}\Big(b_0^0(\exp) - b_0^0(\mathrm{tree}) - b_0^0(\mathrm{rho})\Big) - \frac{91}{108} = 3 \pm 1 \\
16\pi^2\hat{c}_1 &= 16\pi^2 20\pi f_\pi^4\Big(a_2^0(\exp) - a_2^0(\mathrm{rho})\Big) + \frac{73}{180} = 2 \pm 1 \\
16\pi^2\hat{c}_1 &= 16\pi^2\frac{24\pi f_\pi^4}{m_\pi^2}\Big(a_1^1(\exp) - a_1^1(\mathrm{tree}) - a_1^1(\mathrm{rho})\Big) + \frac{1}{4} = 2 \pm 5 \\
16\pi^2\hat{c}_1 &= 16\pi^2\frac{32\pi f_\pi^4}{3m_\pi^4}\Big(a_0^2(\exp) - a_0^2(\mathrm{tree})\Big) - \frac{4}{3} = 26 \pm 21 \\
16\pi^2\hat{c}_1 &= 16\pi^2\frac{8\pi f_\pi^4}{3m_\pi^2}\Big(b_0^2(\exp) - b_0^2(\mathrm{tree}) - b_0^2(\mathrm{rho})\Big) - \frac{35}{36} = -1 \pm 2 \\
16\pi^2\hat{c}_1 &= 16\pi^2 40\pi f_\pi^4\Big(a_2^2(\exp) - a_2^2(\mathrm{rho})\Big) + \frac{19}{90} = 3 \pm 1
\end{aligned}
\tag{302}
$$

which is seen to be consistent, to the the possible exception of $16\pi^2\hat{c}_1 = -1 \pm 2$. The value $16\pi^2\hat{c}_1 = 26 \pm 21$ involves a large error bar and should not be taken seriously. We note, however, that overall consistency can be achieved with 1.1 standard deviation. Alternatively, one can input either a scattering length or a range parameter to fix $\hat{c}_1$, and predict the remaining scattering lengths and range parameters.

Finally, we note that at low energies the partial phase shifts have been usually extracted from the high statistics experiments carried out both at CERN and Saclay using K_{e4} decays [64]. The near future experiments planned at DAΦNE are expected to give much better accuracy [65] in the threshold region, allowing for a detailed comparison between various theoretical proposals. In light of this, we will give elsewhere a comprehensive analysis of the phase shifts near threshold as they follow from our exact (expanded) results, in comparison with one-loop chiral perturbation theory, dispersion methods and the data [63].

18.6. Fusion Process : $\gamma\gamma \to \pi\pi$

A sixth consequence of our assumptions is the fusion process $\gamma\gamma \to \pi\pi$. Specifically, consider $\gamma(q_1)\gamma(q_2) \to \pi(k_1)\pi(k_2)$ in the gauge where the photon polarisabilities satisfy the condition $\epsilon_\mu(q_i)q_j^\mu = 0$, with $i, j = 1, 2$. The Mandelstam variables are

$$\begin{aligned} s &= (q_1+q_2)^2 = 2q_1\cdot q_2 \\ t &= (q_1-k_1)^2 = m_\pi^2 - 2q_1\cdot k_1 \\ u &= (q_1-k_2)^2 = m_\pi^2 - 2q_1\cdot k_2 \end{aligned} \tag{303}$$

Throughout $q_1^2 = q_2^2 = 0$ and $p_1^2 = p_2^2 = m_\pi^2$. The case of one or two tagged photons will not be discussed here. Contracting the photon polarisations with (218-221) and using the mass shell conditions give

$$\begin{aligned} &+i\epsilon_1\cdot\epsilon_2\Big(\epsilon^{bce}\epsilon^{eda} + \epsilon^{bde}\epsilon^{eca}\Big) \\ &+4i\epsilon_1\cdot\epsilon_2\Big(\frac{1}{u-m_\pi^2}\epsilon^{bcf}\epsilon^{fda} + \frac{1}{t-m_\pi^2}\epsilon^{bdf}\epsilon^{fca}\Big) \\ &+\frac{1}{2f_\pi^2}\epsilon_1^\mu\epsilon_2^\nu(k_2-k_1)^\beta\epsilon^{abg}\int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y - iq_2\cdot z} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\mathbf{V}^g_\beta(0)\Big)|0 > \\ &+\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\epsilon_1^\mu\epsilon_2^\nu k_1^\alpha k_2^\beta\int d^4y d^4z_1 d^4z_2 e^{-iq_1\cdot y + ik_1\cdot z_1 + ik_2\cdot z_2} \\ &\times < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(0)\Big)|0 > \\ &-\frac{1}{f_\pi}m_\pi^2\delta^{ab}\epsilon_1^\mu\epsilon_2^\nu\int d^4y d^4z e^{-iq_1\cdot y - iq_2\cdot z} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(z)\hat{\sigma}(0)\Big)|0 > \end{aligned} \tag{304}$$

We observe that on-shell the a_1 contribution through $< \mathbf{j}_A\mathbf{j}_A >$ drops. The first and second term in (304) are the seagull and Born terms respectively. Typical contributions to the remaining correlators in (304) are shown in Fig. 7. To estimate the various vacuum correlators entering (304) we will use our one loop effective action.

To one-loop, the contribution to the three-point vector correlator $< \mathbf{VVV} >$ contains a divergent part given by c_1 and a finite part. Using (240) we have

$$< 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(y)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(y)\mathbf{V}^e_\rho(z)\Big)|0 >= \quad -c_1 g_{\mu\nu}\epsilon^{cde}\delta^4(x-z)\partial_\rho\delta^4(y-z)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+c_1 g_{\mu\nu}\epsilon^{cde}\delta^4(y-z)\partial_\rho\delta^4(x-z)\\
&+\epsilon^{cde}\int\frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}\int\frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4}e^{iq\cdot x-ip\cdot y-i(q-p)\cdot z}\mathcal{J}_{\mu\nu\rho}(q,p)
\end{aligned}
\tag{305}
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}_{\mu\nu\rho}(q,p)=i\int\frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4}\Big(\quad &\frac{1}{k^2-m_\pi^2+i0}\frac{1}{(k+q)^2-m_\pi^2+i0}\frac{1}{(k+p)^2-m_\pi^2+i0}\\
&\times(2k_\mu+q_\mu)(2k_\nu+p_\nu)(2k_\rho+(q-p)_\rho)+\text{counterterms}\Big)
\end{aligned}
\tag{306}
$$

The one-loop contribution to the three-point correlator $<\mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}\hat{\sigma}>$ in (304) is finite since the divergences in Fig. 6b and Fig. 6c cancel out. Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
&<0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(x)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(y)\hat{\sigma}(z)\Big)|0>_{\text{conn.}}=\\
&+\frac{2}{f_\pi}\delta^{cd}g_{\mu\nu}\delta^4(x-y)\int\frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4}e^{-iq\cdot(y-z)}\mathcal{J}(q^2)\\
&+\frac{2}{f_\pi}\delta^{cd}\int\frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}\int\frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4}e^{iq\cdot x-ip\cdot y-i(q-p)\cdot z}\mathcal{J}_{\mu\nu}(q,p)
\end{aligned}
\tag{307}
$$

where $\mathcal{J}(q^2)$ is given by (271-272) and $\mathcal{J}_{\mu\nu}(q,p)$ is defined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}_{\mu\nu}(q,p)=i\int\frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4}\Big(\quad &\frac{1}{k^2-m_\pi^2+i0}\frac{1}{(k+q)^2-m_\pi^2+i0}\frac{1}{(k+p)^2-m_\pi^2+i0}\\
&\times(2k_\mu+q_\mu)(2k_\nu+p_\nu)-(q=p=0)\Big)
\end{aligned}
\tag{308}
$$

Finally, the four-point function $<\mathbf{j}_A\mathbf{j}_A\mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}>$ is also finite by the same argument as above, since $\hat{s}=s\mathbf{1}-\underline{a}_\mu\underline{a}^\mu$. Thus, to one-loop

$$
\begin{aligned}
&<0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(z_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(z_2)\mathbf{V}^c_\mu(x)\mathbf{V}^d_\nu(y)\Big)|0>_{\text{conn.}}=\\
&-i\Big(2\delta^{ab}\delta^{cd}+\delta^{ac}\delta^{bd}+\delta^{ad}\delta^{bc}\Big)g_{\mu\nu}g_{\alpha\beta}\\
&\times\delta^4(x-y)\delta^4(z_1-z_2)\int\frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4}e^{-iq\cdot(y-z_1)}\mathcal{J}(q^2)\\
&-i\Big(2\delta^{ab}\delta^{cd}+\delta^{ac}\delta^{bd}+\delta^{ad}\delta^{bc}\Big)g_{\alpha\beta}\delta^4(z_1-z_2)\\
&\times\int\frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}\int\frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4}e^{+iq\cdot x-ip\cdot y-i(q-p)\cdot z_1}\mathcal{J}_{\mu\nu}(q,p)
\end{aligned}
\tag{309}
$$

Inserting (305,307,309) into (304) and performing the Fourier transforms yield

$$\begin{aligned}
&+i\epsilon_1\cdot\epsilon_2\Big(\epsilon^{bce}\epsilon^{eda}+\epsilon^{bde}\epsilon^{eca}\Big)\\
&+4i\epsilon_1\cdot k_1\epsilon_2\cdot k_2\Big(\frac{1}{u-m_\pi^2}\epsilon^{bcf}\epsilon^{fda}+\frac{1}{t-m_\pi^2}\epsilon^{bdf}\epsilon^{fca}\Big)\\
&+\frac{1}{2f_\pi^2}\epsilon^{abg}\epsilon^{cdg}\Big(ic_1\epsilon_1\cdot\epsilon_2(t-u)+\epsilon_1^\mu\epsilon_2^\nu(k_2-k_1)^\beta\mathcal{J}_{\mu\nu\beta}(q_1,-q_2)\Big)\\
&-\frac{i}{2f_\pi^2}(s-2m_\pi^2)\Big(2\delta^{ab}\delta^{cd}+\delta^{ac}\delta^{bd}+\delta^{ad}\delta^{bc}\Big)\Big(\epsilon_1\cdot\epsilon_2\mathcal{J}(s)+\epsilon_1^\mu\epsilon_2^\nu\mathcal{J}_{\mu\nu}(q_1,-q_2)\Big)\\
&-\frac{2i}{f_\pi^2}m_\pi^2\delta^{ab}\delta^{cd}\Big(\epsilon_1\cdot\epsilon_2\mathcal{J}(s)+\epsilon_1^\mu\epsilon_2^\nu\mathcal{J}_{\mu\nu}(q_1,-q_2)\Big)
\end{aligned}\tag{310}$$

Using the results of Appendix F, we have

$$+\epsilon_1^\mu\epsilon_2^\nu\mathcal{J}_{\mu\nu}(q_1,-q_2)=2\epsilon_1\cdot\epsilon_2\ \mathcal{K}(s)\tag{311}$$

and

$$+\epsilon_1^\mu\epsilon_2^\nu(k_2-k_1)^\beta\mathcal{J}_{\mu\nu\beta}(q_1,-q_2)=-2i\epsilon_1\cdot\epsilon_2(t-u)\mathcal{H}(s)\tag{312}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&+i\epsilon_1\cdot\epsilon_2\Big(\epsilon^{bce}\epsilon^{eda}+\epsilon^{bde}\epsilon^{eca}\Big)\\
&+4i\epsilon_1\cdot k_1\epsilon_2\cdot k_2\Big(\frac{1}{u-m_\pi^2}\epsilon^{bcf}\epsilon^{fda}+\frac{1}{t-m_\pi^2}\epsilon^{bdf}\epsilon^{fca}\Big)\\
&+\frac{1}{2f_\pi^2}\epsilon_1\cdot\epsilon_2(t-u)\epsilon^{abg}\epsilon^{cdg}\Big(c_1-2\mathcal{H}(s)\Big)\\
&-\frac{i}{2f_\pi^2}\epsilon_1\cdot\epsilon_2(s-2m_\pi^2)\Big(2\delta^{ab}\delta^{cd}+\delta^{ac}\delta^{bd}+\delta^{ad}\delta^{bc}\Big)\Big(\mathcal{J}(s)+2\mathcal{K}(s)\Big)\\
&-\frac{2i}{f_\pi^2}\epsilon_1\cdot\epsilon_2m_\pi^2\delta^{ab}\delta^{cd}\Big(\mathcal{J}(s)+2\mathcal{K}(s)\Big)
\end{aligned}\tag{313}$$

The explicit form of $\mathcal{J}(s)$, $\mathcal{K}(s)$ and $\mathcal{H}(s)$ are given in Appendix F.

- $\gamma\gamma\to\pi^0\pi^0$

For the neutral fusion process $\gamma\gamma\to\pi^0\pi^0$ the first (seagull), second (Born) and third terms in (313) drop and the contracted amplitude reduces to

$$\mathcal{T}_{\gamma\gamma\to\pi^0\pi^0}=-\frac{2ie^2}{f_\pi^2}\epsilon_1\cdot\epsilon_2\Big(\mathcal{J}(s)+2\mathcal{K}(s)\Big)(s-m_\pi^2)\tag{314}$$

Using $s \geq 4m_\pi^2$

$$-16\pi^2\Big(\mathcal{J}(s)+2\mathcal{K}(s)\Big)=1+\frac{m_\pi^2}{s}\Big(\ln\Big(\frac{\sqrt{s}-\sqrt{s-4m_\pi^2}}{\sqrt{s}+\sqrt{s-4m_\pi^2}}\Big)+i\pi\Big)^2 \tag{315}$$

we finally obtain

$$\mathcal{T}_{\gamma\gamma\to\pi^0\pi^0}=-\frac{2ie^2}{16\pi^2 f_\pi^2}\epsilon_1\cdot\epsilon_2(s-m_\pi^2)\Big(1+\frac{m_\pi^2}{s}\Big(\ln\Big(\frac{\sqrt{s}-\sqrt{s-4m_\pi^2}}{\sqrt{s}+\sqrt{s-4m_\pi^2}}\Big)+i\pi\Big)^2\Big) \tag{316}$$

in agreement with the result derived using one-loop chiral perturbation theory without kaon loops [43].

The differential cross section for the neutral fusion process follows from (316) in the following form

$$\Big(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\Big)_{\gamma\gamma\to\pi^0\pi^0}=\frac{\alpha^2\beta_V}{4s}|\frac{m_\pi}{2\alpha}\alpha_\pi^0(s)s|^2 \tag{317}$$

with a neutral polarisation function for the fusion process given by

$$\alpha_\pi^0(s)=\frac{\alpha}{8\pi^2 m_\pi f_\pi^2}\Big(\frac{m_\pi^2}{s}-1\Big)\Big(1+\frac{m_\pi^2}{s}\Big(\ln\Big(\frac{\sqrt{s}-\sqrt{s-4m_\pi^2}}{\sqrt{s}+\sqrt{s-4m_\pi^2}}\Big)+i\pi\Big)^2\Big) \tag{318}$$

Here β_V β_V is the pion velocity in the CM frame.

- $\gamma\gamma\to\pi^+\pi^-$

For the charged fusion process $\gamma\gamma\to\pi^+\pi^-$ the seagull and Born terms in (313) contribute. The final contracted amplitude is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T}_{\gamma\gamma\to\pi^+\pi^-}= \quad & -2ie^2\epsilon_1\cdot\epsilon_2\Big(1-\frac{s}{32\pi^2 f_\pi^2}\Big(1+\frac{m_\pi^2}{s}\Big(\ln\Big(\frac{\sqrt{s}-\sqrt{s-4m_\pi^2}}{\sqrt{s}+\sqrt{s-4m_\pi^2}}\Big)+i\pi\Big)^2\Big)\Big)\\ & -4ie^2\epsilon_1\cdot k_1\epsilon_2\cdot k_2\Big(\frac{1}{t-m_\pi^2}+\frac{1}{u-m_\pi^2}\Big)\end{aligned} \tag{319}$$

This result is different from the result obtained from one-loop chiral perturbation theory [43].

The differential cross section for the charged fusion process follows from (319) in the following form

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\Big)_{\gamma\gamma\to\pi^+\pi^-}=\frac{\alpha^2\beta_V}{4s}\Big(\quad & +|1+\frac{m_\pi}{2\alpha}\alpha_\pi^\pm(s)s|^2\\ & +|\mathbf{B}+\frac{m_\pi}{2\alpha}\alpha_\pi^\pm(s)s|^2\Big)\end{aligned} \tag{320}$$

with a charged polarisation function for the fusion process given by

$$\alpha_\pi^\pm(s) = -\frac{\alpha}{16\pi^2 m_\pi f_\pi^2}\Big(\frac{m_\pi^2}{s} - 1\Big)\Big(1 + \frac{m_\pi^2}{s}\Big(\ln\Big(\frac{\sqrt{s} - \sqrt{s - 4m_\pi^2}}{\sqrt{s} + \sqrt{s - 4m_\pi^2}}\Big) + i\pi\Big)^2\Big) \tag{321}$$

and a Born contribution

$$\mathbf{B} = -1 + \frac{2sm_\pi^2}{(t - m_\pi^2)(u - m_\pi^2)} \tag{322}$$

18.7. Compton Scattering : $\gamma\pi \to \gamma\pi$

The one-loop Compton scattering amplitudes follow from the one-loop fusion amplitudes by crossing $s \to t$ in the region $t \leq 0$.

- $\gamma\pi^0 \to \gamma\pi^0$

The differential cross section for the neutral Compton process is

$$\Big(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\Big)_{\gamma\pi^0 \to \gamma\pi^0} = \frac{m_\pi^2}{4s}|\alpha_\pi^0(t)t|^2 \tag{323}$$

with again

$$\alpha_\pi^0(t) = \frac{\alpha}{8\pi^2 m_\pi f_\pi^2}\Big(\frac{m_\pi^2}{t} - 1\Big)\Big(1 + \frac{m_\pi^2}{t}\ln^2\Big(\frac{\sqrt{t} - \sqrt{t - 4m_\pi^2}}{\sqrt{t} + \sqrt{t - 4m_\pi^2}}\Big)\Big) \tag{324}$$

For $t \leq 0$ the logarithm in (324) may be Taylor expanded

$$\ln^2\Big(\frac{\sqrt{t} - \sqrt{t - 4m_\pi^2}}{\sqrt{t} + \sqrt{t - 4m_\pi^2}}\Big) = -\frac{t}{m_\pi^2} - \frac{1}{12}\Big(\frac{t}{m_\pi^2}\Big) + \mathcal{O}\Big(\Big(\frac{t}{m_\pi^2}\Big)^3\Big) \tag{325}$$

Inserting (325) into (324) yields the neutral pion polarisabilities at $t = 0$,

$$\alpha_\pi^0 = -\beta_\pi^0 = \alpha_\pi^0(0) = -\frac{\alpha}{96\pi^2 m_\pi f_\pi^2} = -0.49\ 10^{-4}\ \mathrm{fm}^3 \tag{326}$$

in agreement with the result obtained in the context of one-loop chiral perturbation theory [66]. In the latter, the kaon loops do not not contribute at threshold. The result (326) is to be compared with two existing measurements $|\alpha_\pi^0(\mathrm{exp})| = (0.69 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.04)\ 10^{-4}$ fm^3 [66] and $|\alpha_\pi^0(\mathrm{exp})| = (0.8 \pm 2.0)\ 10^{-4}$ fm^3 [67]. The first empirical value relies on the high statistics data from MARK II at SLAC [46], and appears to be more reliable than the second one.

- $\gamma\pi^\pm \to \gamma\pi^\pm$

The differential cross section for the charged Compton process is

$$\left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\right)_{\gamma\pi^\pm\to\gamma\pi^\pm} = \frac{\alpha^2}{2s}\Big(\quad +|1+\frac{m_\pi}{2\alpha}\alpha_\pi^\pm(t)t|^2 \\ +|\overline{\mathbf{B}}+\frac{m_\pi}{2\alpha}\alpha_\pi^\pm(t)t|^2\Big) \tag{327}$$

with a charged polarisation function for the charged Compton process given by (321) with $s \to t$, and a Born contribution

$$\overline{\mathbf{B}} = -1 + \frac{2tm_\pi^2}{(s-m_\pi^2)(u-m_\pi^2)} \tag{328}$$

From (321) with $s \to t$ and the Taylor expansion (325) we conclude that the one-loop pion charge polarisabilities vanish

$$\alpha_\pi^\pm = -\beta_\pi^\pm = \alpha_\pi^\pm(t=0) = 0 \tag{329}$$

This result is to be compared with the one-loop chiral perturbation theory result $\alpha^\pm = 2.7$ 10^{-4} fm^3 [48, 52], and the following three empirical results

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_\pi^+(\text{exp}) = &\quad (20 \pm 12)\ 10^{-4}\ \text{fm}^3 \\ \alpha_\pi^+(\text{exp}) = &\quad (6.8 \pm 1.4 \pm 1.2)\ 10^{-4}\ \text{fm}^3 \\ \alpha_\pi^+(\text{exp}) = &\quad (2.2 \pm 1.6)\ 10^{-4}\ \text{fm}^3 \end{aligned} \tag{330}$$

from [68], [69] and [66] respectively. The last measurement follows from the high statistics data of the MARK II collaboration at SLAC using $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$.

The result (329) appears to be compatible with the vanishing of the axial structure form factor (263) in $\pi \to e\nu\gamma$ to one-loop, and thus $\gamma = 0$. The possible relationship between γ and the electric pion polarisability was first suggested by Terentev using the soft pion limit [48]. From (263) and (231) it appears that the correspondence implied by the soft pion limit does not hold in general.

We note that the non-vanishing of the axial form factor in one-loop chiral perturbation theory through the combination of parameters $L_9 + L_{10} \neq 0$ [66, 52], is also what makes the charged pion electric polarisability nonzero. We have already indicated above that to one-loop the axial form factor (263) vanishes. The axial correlator does not acquire a transverse part, and *a priori* does not need to be renormalized, thus the consistency of our two-parameter effective action. The finite $a_1 \sim 3\pi$ contribution is expected at two-loops and higher.

Given the large discrepancies in the extracted polarisabilities quoted above, we cannot conclude whether our estimates for the neutral or charged pion electric polarisabilities, rule in or out the two-parameter one-loop effective action we have suggested. The forthcoming measurements of the pion electric polarisabilities at FERMILAB are therefore welcome.

19. Discussion

We have set up a general framework for analyzing the consequences of chiral $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ for both QCD and the nonlinear sigma model. Our derivation in section 4 shows that the main results (53,104,105) are simply restatements of the the symmetry conditions (68-69) subject to the boundary conditions (56-57). The latter in turn are equivalent to

$$< 0|\mathbf{A}^a_\mu(x)|\pi^b(p) >= i f_\pi p_\mu \delta^{ab} e^{-ip\cdot x} \tag{331}$$

given the absence of stable axial vector mesons or other stable pseudoscalars. Hence any result which is a consequence of symmetry and (331) as well as general principles such as unitarity and causality is contained in (53,104,105) plus general principles. We are then justified in calling them master formulas. The subsequent exact formulas we have derived prior to any expansion, encompass both the results of few-loops chiral perturbation theory, dispersion relations or models. They provide important insights to low energy processes at and beyond threshold. They form the core results of this paper.

The only other non-trivial assumption in our work is power counting in $1/f_\pi$. This counting is not without problems. Indeed, it is known that the GOR relation (234) gives rise to the $U_A(1)$ problem. It also gives a non-zero contribution to the cosmological constant, which must be subtracted one way or another. However, if a subtraction is made, there is no guarantee that the relation will remain operationally meaningful.

The various analyses of sections 5-12 show that the standard results of current algebra (Goldberger-Treiman, Tomozawa-Weinberg, Adler-Weisberger) as well as results on $\pi N \to \pi\pi N$, $\gamma N \to \pi\pi N$, $\pi N \to \pi\gamma N$, $\gamma N \to \pi N$ and others do not provide tests of (234), since $< 0|\hat{\sigma}|0 >$ appears only in disconnected pieces and gets canceled. The Weinberg sum rules or other high-energy results are also insensitive to (234), since free quark theory or perturbative QCD do not give rise to symmetry breaking in the chiral limit. Therefore, a test of (234) must rely on the on- and off-shell radiative decay $\pi \rightarrow e\nu\gamma$ of the pion, $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$ fusion, $\gamma\pi \rightarrow \gamma\pi$, or $\pi\pi$ scattering within the present framework [3].

We may note that a few authors [55] have advocated an alternative scenario of chiral symmetry breaking without the GOR relation (234) and a corresponding generalization of chiral perturbation theory [70]. However, we have been unable so far to find an expansion scheme within our framework that is compatible with this alternative.

In any event, there is no doubt that the $1/f_\pi$ counting we have assumed is valid for the non-linear sigma model, so we may compare our results with the work of Gasser and Leutwyler [8], who also start with the nonlinear sigma model coupled to external fields. At one-loop level ten parameters : $l_1, ..., l_7$ and $h_1, ..., h_3$ are then introduced. Among these, l_7 and h_3 refer to the densities $\overline{q}i\gamma_5 q$ and $\overline{q}\tau^a q$, both of which are associated with isospin breaking that we have ignored. The parameters h_1 and h_2 do not enter the expression for physical quantities. Overall, only six parameters are left to compare with. The general analysis of one-loop effects in Appendix E is overall compatible with this result. However, we arrive at some different conclusions. In particular, we find that chiral symmetry does not impose any constraints on $\pi\pi$ scattering at one-loop level other than those already given by unitarity, causality and the tree result (173), and that all six parameters can be extracted from pionic data without recourse to $SU(3)$ or other considerations. Also, there are unresolved issues in the approach suggested by Gasser and Leutwyler, as we discuss in Appendix G. Finally, since the approach we suggested in section 18 makes use of only two parameters, a discussion is now needed.

The point is that we are not necessarily forced to entertain the most general possibility that is compatible with unitarity, causality and (broken) chiral symmetry. A good example is conventional renormalization theory. Nothing in the general principles of causality, unitarity and so on forbids the introduction of non-renormalizable counterterms in a renormalizable theory (at least within a perturbative context), but this is not ordinarily done.

Similarly, while we pay due respect to unitarity, causality and chiral symmetry, we may attempt to do so with a minimal number of free parameters. In particular, while the master formulas and the results that follow from it are quite general as we have seen, the one-loop effective action of section 18 was subjected to the maximum number of constraints that could reasonably be imposed. These assumptions were theoretically motivated by simple power counting, and simplified solutions. The major outcome of these assumptions was the GOR relation and the KSFR relation, giving a motivation *a posteriori*. Also we found that in the on-shell radiative decay $\pi \to e\nu\gamma$, the ratio γ (of the two structure dependent axial and vector currents) vanishes, that in the off-shell radiative decay the axial structure form-factor R is consistent with the soft pion result, and that the pion polarisabilities are $\alpha_\pi^0 = -\beta_\pi^0 = -0.49\ 10^4\ \mathrm{fm}^3$ and $\alpha_\pi^\pm = -\beta_\pi^\pm = 0$. The overall uncertainties in the present measurements of these low-energy parameters, do not allow for a definite assessment of our new one-loop effective action. Better measurements are therefore called for.

---

[3] A possible alternative framework would be the QCD sum rules. However, they suffer from precision statements and also face the same problem with the cosmological constant.

A feature of our approach which deserves attention is that processes involving nucleons could be discussed as well as purely pionic processes, in contrast with some other approaches. Moreover, the effects of the vector mesons are unambiguously accounted for. Also, unlike chiral perturbation theory, it is unnecessary to start from the chiral limit, once the explicit symmetry breaking term is given. This has allowed us to bypass the issue of chiral logarithms associated with vanishing energy denominators. While such terms are theoretically interesting and serve as useful checks, their appearance is cumbersome if the goal is to derive relations between experimentally measurable quantities. Finally, one aspect of current algebra which is clear from our derivation but not chiral perturbation theory is that the exact formulas of current algebra alone actually do not constitute a test of the idea that pions are Nambu-Goldstone bosons in the chiral limit. Indeed, the formulas are valid even if $f_\pi \to 0$ or ∞ as $m_\pi \to 0$. It is only when extra assumptions such as the possibility of a loop expansion are introduced that the nature of the chiral limit becomes relevant.

We may also note that in our approach, we could work with finite equations, once it is known that renormalization does not spoil the current conservation equations through anomalies. In section 18, we have adopted a conventional analysis in terms of divergent diagrams, but this could also be avoided in principle since (235) is a finite equation. In particular, for ordinary scalar theories our approach correctly handles overlapping divergences at the two-loop level [14]. Thus, a two-loop calculation in our scheme is feasible. In fact, it is not difficult to write down the required equations as shown in Appendix H. We hope to give a detailed account of these equations in the future.

Finally, we would like to point out that there is in principle no difficulty in incorporating isospin breaking effects into our framework. However, a quantitative analysis requires the consideration of competing electromagnetic effects, so we will not pursue this point here. Given the interest in threshold low energy processes beyond leading order, it is desirable that the present formalism be extended so as to include baryon dynamics. This and related issues are currently under investigation.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by the US DOE grant DE-FG-88ER40388.

Appendix A : Quantum Field Theory minus Feynman Streamlined

The advantages of working with the Peierls formula for the commutator (24-26) has been emphasized by DeWitt [71]. Here, we shall list some further applications of the Schwinger-Peierls-Bogoliubov relations (12-13,20-30).

One case is when the system is in some pure or mixed state in the remote past, in which case we immediately obtain the generalized Green-Kubo formula

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta v^{\nu b}(y)}\langle \mathbf{V}^a_\mu(x)\rangle = i\langle R^*\Big[\mathbf{V}^a_\mu(x), \mathbf{V}^b_\nu(y)\Big]\rangle \tag{332}$$

where $\langle\ \rangle$ denotes the ensemble average.

Another case arises if we introduce a c-number source following Schwinger[4]

$$\mathbf{I}[\phi] \to \mathbf{I}[\phi] + \int d^4x\, J(x)\phi(x) \tag{333}$$

We then have

$$\phi(x) = -i\mathcal{S}^\dagger[J]\Big(\frac{\delta \mathcal{S}[J]}{\delta J(x)}\Big)\ . \tag{334}$$

We further assume that

$$\phi(x) \to \phi_{\rm in,out}(x) \qquad\qquad x^0 \to \mp\infty \tag{335}$$

so that we have the Yang-Feldman equations

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(x) =& \quad \phi_{\rm in}(x) + \int d^4y\Delta_R(x-y)j(y)\\ =& \quad \mathcal{S}^\dagger[J]\phi_{\rm in}(x)\mathcal{S}[J] + \int d^4y\Delta_A(x-y)j(y)\end{aligned} \tag{336}$$

$$j(x) = \Big(-\Box - m^2\Big)\phi(x). \tag{337}$$

Combining (334-337) as in (89-90) and (103-105), yields

$$\Big[a_{\rm in}(k), \mathcal{S}[J]\Big] = -\int d^4y e^{ik\cdot y}\Big(-\Box - m^2\Big)\frac{\delta\mathcal{S}}{\delta J(y)} \tag{338}$$

$$\Big[\mathcal{S}[J], a^\dagger_{\rm in}(k)\Big] = -\int d^4y e^{-ik\cdot y}\Big(-\Box - m^2\Big)\frac{\delta\mathcal{S}}{\delta J(y)}. \tag{339}$$

---

[4] Schwinger has subsequently criticised the use of field operators. However, unitarity and causality of the S-matrix in the presence of a c-number source imply the existence of local field operators, as we have seen.

Iteration then gives the generalized WLSZ formula

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big[...\Big[\Big[\mathcal{S}[J], a^{\dagger}_{\text{in}}(k_1)\Big]a^{\dagger}_{\text{in}}(k_2)\Big]...a^{\dagger}_{\text{in}}(k_n)\Big] \\
= \quad & (-1)^n \int d^4y_1...d^4y_n e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1-...-ik_n\cdot y_n}\Big(-\Box_1 - m^2\Big)...\Big(-\Box_n - m^2\Big)\frac{\delta^n\mathcal{S}[J]}{\delta J(y_1)...\delta J(y_n)} \\
= \quad & (-i)^n \int d^4y_1...d^4y_n e^{-ik_1\cdot y_1...-ik_n\cdot y_n}\Big(-\Box_1 - m^2\Big)...\Big(-\Box_n - m^2\Big)\mathcal{S}[J]T^*\Big(\phi(y_1)...\phi(y_n)\Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{340}$$

We may also consider the case when the action splits into a free part and an interacting part

$$\mathbf{I}[\phi] = \mathbf{I}_{\text{free}}[\phi] + \int d^4x\, g\, \mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}(\phi(x)). \tag{341}$$

Following Gell-Mann and Low we take g to be variable

$$\mathbf{I}[\phi] \to \mathbf{I}_{\text{free}}[\phi] + \int d^4x\, g(x)\, \mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}(\phi(x)). \tag{342}$$

We then have

$$\frac{\delta^n\mathcal{S}[g]}{\delta g(x_1)...\delta g(x_n)} = (+i)^n\mathcal{S}[g]T^*\Big(\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}(\phi(x_1))...\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}(\phi(x_n))\Big). \tag{343}$$

Expansion in a formal power series gives the Lagrangian version of Dyson's formula

$$\mathcal{S}[g] = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{i^n}{n!}\int d^4x_1...d^4x_n\, g(x_1)...g(x_n)\, T^*\Big(\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}(\phi_{\text{in}}(x_1))....\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}(\phi_{\text{in}}(x_n))\Big). \tag{344}$$

We may further combine (333) and (342) to obtain the Gell-Mann-Low formula

$$\begin{aligned}
T^*\Big(\phi(x_1)...\phi(x_m)\Big)_{J=0} = \quad & \mathcal{S}^{\dagger}[g]\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{i^n}{n!}\int d^4y_1...d^4y_n\, g(y_1)...g(y_n) \\
& T^*\Big(\phi_{\text{in}}(x_1)...\phi_{\text{in}}(x_m)\,\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}(\phi_{\text{in}}(y_1))...\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}(\phi_{\text{in}}(y_n)\Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{345}$$

Another possibility is to use DeWitt's background field method as discussed by one of us [14].

Appendix B : Dirac's Terminology

In this Appendix we introduce some terminology in relation to the constraint problem discussed in section 3. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the subspace of the functions (v, a, J) defined by (34).

Following Dirac, we will call an equation weak if it holds on $\mathcal{M}$ but not necessarily in its neighborhood, and denote it by $\approx$. An equation will be called strong if it holds in some neighborhood of $\mathcal{M}$, and will be denoted by $=$. Since the gradient of the constraint

$$\Big(\frac{\delta}{\delta v^a_\mu(x)}(f_\pi\nabla^\nu a_\nu - J)^b(y), \frac{\delta}{\delta a^a_\mu(x)}(f_\pi\nabla^\nu a_\nu - J)^b(y), \frac{\delta}{\delta J^a(x)}(f_\pi\nabla^\nu a_\nu - J)^b(y)\Big) =$$
$$\Big(- f_\pi\epsilon^{abc}a^{\mu c}(x)\delta^4(x-y), -f_\pi\delta^{ab}\partial^\mu\delta^4(x-y) + f_\pi\epsilon^{abc}v^{\mu c}(x)\delta^4(x-y), -\delta^{ab}\delta^4(x-y)\Big) \tag{346}$$

is nonvanishing, its components define a set of normals on $\mathcal{M}$. A vector with the components $(\xi^a_\mu, \eta^a_\mu, \zeta^a)$ is tangent to $\mathcal{M}$ if and only if

$$\int d^4x\Big(\xi^a_\mu(x)\frac{\delta}{\delta v^a_\mu(x)} + \eta^a_\mu(x)\frac{\delta}{\delta a^a_\mu(x)} + \zeta^a(x)\frac{\delta}{\delta J^a(x)}\Big)(f_\pi\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J)^b(y) =$$
$$- f_\pi(\underline{a}^\mu\xi_\mu)^b(y) + f_\pi(\nabla^\mu\eta_\mu)^b(y) - \zeta^b(y) \tag{347}$$

vanishes at least weakly. Following the mathematical literature, we will identify a vector with the first order linear differential operator

$$\mathbf{X} = \int d^4x\Big(\xi^a_\mu(x)\frac{\delta}{\delta v^a_\mu(x)} + \eta^a_\mu(x)\frac{\delta}{\delta a^a_\mu(x)} + \zeta^a(x)\frac{\delta}{\delta J^a(x)}\Big). \tag{348}$$

The condition for $\mathbf{X}$ to be a tangent vector is then simply given by

$$\mathbf{X}(f_\pi\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J) \approx 0. \tag{349}$$

An example of a tangent vector is

$$\mathbf{T}^a_V(x) = \mathbf{X}^a_V(x) + \underline{J}^{ac}(x)\frac{\delta}{\delta J^c(x)} \tag{350}$$

which is the generator of local isospin transformations in the extended space (v, a, J)

$$\Big[\mathbf{T}^a_V(x), \mathbf{T}^b_V(y)\Big] = -\epsilon^{abc}\mathbf{T}^c_V(y)\delta^4(x-y)\ . \tag{351}$$

Now suppose that f is a functional defined on $\mathcal{M}$, and $f^{(1)}$ and $f^{(2)}$ two smooth extensions to its neighborhood. Since (346) is nonvanishing, we may write

$$f^{(1)} - f^{(2)} = \int d^4y\lambda^b(y)(f_\pi\nabla^\nu a_\nu - J)^b(y) \tag{352}$$

so that

$$\mathbf{X}f^{(1)} - \mathbf{X}f^{(2)} \approx \int d^4y \lambda^b(y)\mathbf{X}(f_\pi \nabla^\nu a_\nu - J)^b(y). \tag{353}$$

It follows that $\mathbf{X}f$ is well defined if $\mathbf{X}$ is a tangent vector. On the other hand, individual partial derivatives are only defined up to the following shifts

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\delta f}{\delta v^a_\mu(x)} &\rightarrow \frac{\delta f}{\delta v^a_\mu(x)} + f_\pi(\underline{a}^\mu \lambda)^a(x) \\
\frac{\delta f}{\delta a^a_\mu(x)} &\rightarrow \frac{\delta f}{\delta a^a_\mu(x)} - f_\pi(\nabla^\mu \lambda)^a(x) \\
\frac{\delta f}{\delta J^a(x)} &\rightarrow \frac{\delta f}{\delta J^a(x)} - \lambda^a(x).
\end{aligned} \tag{354}$$

We observe that λ plays the role of a Lagrange multiplier associated with the constraint (34). Time-ordered and retarded products of the original currents $\mathbf{V}^a_\mu$ and $\mathbf{A}^a_\mu$ may be obtained by applying the tangent vectors

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\delta}{\delta v^a_\mu(x)} + f_\pi \underline{a}^{\mu ac}(x)\frac{\delta}{\delta J^c(x)} \\
&\frac{\delta}{\delta a^a_\mu(x)} - f_\pi \nabla^{\mu ac}(x)\frac{\delta}{\delta J^c(x)}
\end{aligned} \tag{355}$$

to (36-38).

Appendix C : Four Dimensional Gell-Mann Algebra

The case for which the Dirac's constraint problem can be solved explicitly is of some interest. Consider the case of only left handed external fields, $v^a_\mu = -a^a_\mu = w^a_\mu/2$ and $J^a = 0$. The Veltman-Bell equation reads

$$\nabla^\mu_L \mathbf{L}_\mu = 0 \qquad\qquad \mathbf{L}_\mu = \frac{1}{2}\Big(\mathbf{V}_\mu - \mathbf{A}_\mu\Big) \tag{356}$$

where $\nabla^\mu_L = \partial^\mu + \underline{w}^\mu$. For the nonlinear sigma model, $\mathbf{L}^a_\mu$ is the Sugawara current [72]. The constraint $\partial^\alpha w_\alpha = 0$ may be solved as

$$w^a_\alpha = \partial^\mu W^a_{\mu\alpha} \qquad\qquad W^a_{\mu\alpha} = -W^a_{\alpha\mu} \tag{357}$$

The appearance of antisymmetric tensor fields is natural within the context of the nonlinear sigma model [73]. This point was the starting point of our early investigation [39][5].

---

[5] However, the treatment of $\mathbf{L}^a_\mu$ given there is incorrect.

We have

$$\partial_\mu \mathbf{L}_\nu - \partial_\nu \mathbf{L}_\mu = -2\frac{\delta \mathbf{I}}{\delta W^{\mu\nu}} = +2i\mathcal{S}^\dagger \frac{\delta \mathcal{S}}{\delta W^{\mu\nu}} \tag{358}$$

with the asymptotic conditions

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{L}_\mu(x) \to \frac{f_\pi}{2}\partial_\mu \pi_{\text{in,out}}(x) && (x_0 \to \mp\infty) \\ &\partial_\mu \mathbf{L}_\nu(x) - \partial_\nu \mathbf{L}_\mu(x) \to 0 && (x_0 \to \mp\infty) \end{aligned} \tag{359}$$

Eqn. (358) may be solved for $\mathbf{L}^a_\nu$ by first imposing the Fock-Schwinger condition $x^\nu \mathbf{L}^a_\nu = 0$. Multiplying by x^μ then gives

$$x^\mu \partial_\mu \mathbf{L}^a_\nu + \mathbf{L}^a_\nu = 2i\mathcal{S}^\dagger\, x^\mu \frac{\delta \mathcal{S}}{\delta W^{a\mu\nu}} \tag{360}$$

Alternativaly, one may employ the Poincare lemma construction. Either way, the result is

$$\mathbf{L}^a_\nu(x) = +\frac{f_\pi}{2}\partial_\nu \phi^a(x) + 2i\mathcal{S}^\dagger \int_0^x d\xi^\mu \frac{\delta \mathcal{S}}{\delta W^{a\mu\nu}(\xi)} \tag{361}$$

where the line integral is over a straight path from 0 to x. Substituting into the Veltman-Bell equation (356) gives

$$-\nabla^\mu_L \partial_\mu \phi^a(x) = +\frac{4i}{f_\pi}\mathcal{S}^\dagger \nabla^\nu_L \int_0^x d\xi^\mu \frac{\delta \mathcal{S}}{\delta W^{a\mu\nu}(\xi)} \tag{362}$$

Introducing the retarded and advanced Green's functions

$$-\nabla^\mu_L \partial_\mu \mathbf{G}_R(x,y) = \delta^4(x-y)\,\mathbf{1} \tag{363}$$

and solving under (359) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^a(x) = \quad & +\int d^4z \Big(1 + \mathbf{G}_{R,A}\underline{w}^\mu \partial_\mu\Big)^{ac}(x,z)\, \pi^c_{\text{in}\,,\,\text{out}}(z) \\ & +\frac{4i}{f_\pi}\mathcal{S}^\dagger \int d^4z \mathbf{G}^{ac}_{R,A}(x,z) \nabla^{\kappa\, ce}_L(z) \int_0^z d\xi^\alpha \frac{\delta \mathcal{S}}{\delta W^{e\alpha\kappa}(\xi)} \end{aligned} \tag{364}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}^\dagger \pi^a_{\text{in}}(x) \mathcal{S} = \quad & \pi^a_{\text{out}}(x) \\ = \quad & +\int d^4z \Big(\Big(1 + \mathbf{G}_A \underline{w}^\mu \partial_\mu\Big)^{-1}\Big(1 + \mathbf{G}_R \underline{w}^\nu \partial_\nu\Big)\Big)^{ac}(x,z) \pi^c_{\text{in}}(z) \\ & +\frac{4i}{f_\pi}\mathcal{S}^\dagger \int d^4z \Big(\Big(1 + \mathbf{G}_A \underline{w}^\mu \partial_\mu\Big)^{-1} \mathbf{G}\Big)^{ac}(x,z) \nabla^{\kappa\, ce}_L(z) \int_0^z d\xi^\alpha \frac{\delta \mathcal{S}}{\delta W^{e\alpha\kappa}(\xi)} \end{aligned} \tag{365}$$

where $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}_R - \mathbf{G}_A$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{L}^a_\mu(x) = \quad & +\frac{f_\pi}{2}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}\int d^4z\Big(1+\mathbf{G}_A\underline{w}^\mu\partial_\mu\Big)^{ac}(x,z)\pi^c_{\rm out}(z) \\
& +2i\mathcal{S}^\dagger\int_0^x d\xi^\alpha\frac{\delta\mathcal{S}}{\delta W^{a\alpha\mu}(\xi)} \\
& +2i\mathcal{S}^\dagger\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}\int d^4z\mathbf{G}^{ac}_A(x,z)\nabla^{\kappa\, ce}_L(z)\int_0^z d\xi^\alpha\frac{\delta\mathcal{S}}{\delta W^{e\alpha\kappa}(\xi)}
\end{aligned} \tag{366}$$

The commutator of two currents may be computed from (365, 366) by noting that

$$\delta\mathbf{G}_{R,A} = \mathbf{G}_{R,A}\,\delta\underline{w}^\mu\partial_\mu\mathbf{G}_{R,A} \tag{367}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big[\pi_{\rm out},\mathcal{S}^\dagger\delta\mathcal{S}\Big] = \quad & \delta\pi_{\rm out} \\
= \quad & +\frac{2}{f_\pi}\Big(1+\mathbf{G}_A\underline{w}^\mu\partial_\mu\Big)^{-1}\mathbf{G}\delta\underline{w}^\alpha\mathbf{L}_\alpha \\
& +\frac{4i}{f_\pi}\Big(1+\mathbf{G}_A\underline{w}^\mu\partial_\mu\Big)^{-1}\mathbf{G}\nabla^\kappa\int d\xi^\mu\delta\Big(\mathcal{S}^\dagger\frac{\delta\mathcal{S}}{\delta W^{\mu\kappa}(\xi)}\Big)
\end{aligned} \tag{368}$$

We find

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big[\mathbf{L}^a_\mu(x),\mathbf{L}^b_\nu(y)\Big] = \quad & -i\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}\int_0^y d\eta^\beta\mathbf{G}^{ac}(x,\eta)\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial\eta^\beta}\epsilon^{cbe}\mathbf{L}^e_\nu(\eta) \\
& +i\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}\int_0^y d\eta^\beta\mathbf{G}^{ac}(x,\eta)\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial\eta^\nu}\epsilon^{cbe}\mathbf{L}^e_\beta(\eta) \\
& -i\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}\int_0^y d\eta^\beta\mathbf{G}^{ac}(x,\eta)\epsilon^{cbe}\Big(\partial_\beta\mathbf{L}^e_\nu-\partial_\nu\mathbf{L}^e_\beta\Big)(\eta) \\
& -4\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}\int d^4z\mathbf{G}^{ac}_R(x,z)\nabla^{\kappa ce}_L(z)\int_0^z d\xi^\alpha\int_0^y d\eta^\beta \\
& \times\frac{\delta}{\delta W^{b\beta\nu}(\eta)}\Big(\mathcal{S}^\dagger\frac{\delta\mathcal{S}}{\delta W^{e\alpha\kappa}(\xi)}\Big) \\
& +4\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}\int d^4z\mathbf{G}^{ac}_A(x,z)\nabla^{\kappa ce}_L(z)\int_0^z d\xi^\alpha\int_0^y d\eta^\beta \\
& \times\frac{\delta}{\delta W^{e\alpha\kappa}(\eta)}\Big(\mathcal{S}^\dagger\frac{\delta\mathcal{S}}{\delta W^{b\beta\nu}(\xi)}\Big) \\
& -i\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\nu}\int d^4z'\mathbf{G}^{bd}_A(y,z')\nabla^{\lambda df}_L(z')\int_0^{z'}d\eta^\beta \\
& \times\mathbf{G}^{ac}(x,\eta)\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial\eta^\beta}\epsilon^{cfg}\mathbf{L}^g_\lambda(\eta) \\
& +i\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\nu}\int d^4z'\mathbf{G}^{bd}_A(y,z')\nabla^{\lambda df}_L(z')\int_0^{z'}d\eta^\beta
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\times\mathbf{G}^{ac}(x,\eta)\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial\eta^{\lambda}}\epsilon^{cfg}\mathbf{L}^{g}_{\beta}(\eta)\\
&-i\frac{\partial}{\partial x^{\mu}}\frac{\partial}{\partial y^{\nu}}\int d^4z'\mathbf{G}^{bd}_{A}(y,z')\nabla^{\lambda df}_{L}(z')\int_0^{z'}d\eta^{\beta}\\
&\times\mathbf{G}^{ac}(x,\eta)\epsilon^{cfg}\Big(\partial_{\beta}\mathbf{L}^{g}_{\lambda}-\partial_{\lambda}\mathbf{L}^{g}_{\beta}\Big)(\eta)\\
&-4\frac{\partial}{\partial x^{\mu}}\int d^4z\mathbf{G}^{ac}_{R}(x,z)\nabla^{\kappa ce}_{L}(z)\int_0^{z}d\xi^{\alpha}\\
&\times\frac{\partial}{\partial y^{\nu}}\int d^4z'\mathbf{G}^{bd}_{A}(y,z')\nabla^{\lambda df}_{L}(z')\int_0^{z'}d\eta^{\beta}\\
&\times\frac{\delta}{\delta W^{b\lambda\eta}(\eta)}\Big(\mathcal{S}^{\dagger}\frac{\delta\mathcal{S}}{\delta W^{e\alpha\kappa}(\xi)}\Big)\\
&-\Big(x\ \ \mu\ \ a\leftrightarrow y\ \ \nu\ \ b\Big)\\
&+\frac{f_{\pi}^2}{4}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^{\mu}}\frac{\partial}{\partial y^{\nu}}\mathbf{G}^{ab}(x,y)\\
&-4\int_0^{x}d\xi^{\alpha}\int_0^{y}d\eta^{\beta}\Big[\mathcal{S}^{\dagger}\frac{\delta\mathcal{S}}{\delta W^{a\alpha\mu}(\xi)},\mathcal{S}^{\dagger}\frac{\delta\mathcal{S}}{\delta W^{b\beta\nu}(\eta)}\Big]
\end{aligned}
\tag{369}
$$

This may be regarded as a four dimensional extension of the Gell-Mann algebra. Unfortunately, locality is not manifest in (369).

Appendix D : Commutation Relations and Characteristic Curves

This Appendix describes some consistency checks and reformulations of the master equations. We first note that the retarded version of (89) allows us to calculate the retarded commutators involving π. Using (91), we find

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta\pi = \quad &+G_R\Big(\delta\mathbf{K}\Big)\pi - G_R\delta J + G_R\Big(\nabla^{\mu}a_{\mu}-J/f_{\pi}\Big)\\
&+G_R\Big(\nabla^{\mu}\delta a_{\mu}+\delta\underline{v}^{\mu}a_{\mu}-\frac{1}{f_{\pi}}\delta J\Big)\hat{\sigma}\\
&-\frac{1}{f_{\pi}}G_R\Big(\delta\underline{v}^{\mu}\mathbf{j}_{A\mu}+\delta\underline{a}^{\mu}\mathbf{j}_{V\mu}+\nabla^{\mu}\delta\mathbf{j}_{A\mu}+\underline{a}^{\mu}\delta\mathbf{j}_{V\mu}\Big).
\end{aligned}
\tag{370}
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
R^{*}\Big[\pi^{a}(x),\mathbf{j}^{b}_{A\beta}(y)\Big] = \quad &-i\frac{\delta\pi^{a}(x)}{\delta a^{\beta b}(y)}\\
= \quad &+iG^{ac}_{R}(x,y)\underline{a}^{cd}_{\beta}(y)\epsilon^{dbe}\pi^{e}(y)+i\nabla^{bc}_{\beta}(y)\Big(G^{ac}_{R}(x,y)\hat{\sigma}(y)\Big)\\
&+\int d^4x'G^{ac}_{R}(x,x')\Big(\nabla^{\mu}a_{\mu}-J/f_{\pi}\Big)^{c}(x')\ R^{*}\Big[\hat{\sigma}(x'),\mathbf{j}^{b}_{A\beta}(y)\Big]
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi}G_A^{ac}(x,y)\epsilon^{cbd}\Big(\mathbf{j}^b_{V\beta}(y)+f_\pi\underline{a}^{de}_\beta(y)\pi^e(y)\Big)\\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4x'G_R^{ac}(x,x')\Big(\nabla^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^d_{A\alpha}(x'),\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y)\Big]\\
&+\underline{a}^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^d_{V\alpha}(x'),\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y)\Big]\Big)
\end{aligned}
\tag{371}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
R^*\Big[\pi^a(x),\mathbf{j}^b_{V\beta}(y)\Big] = \quad & -i\frac{\delta\pi^a(x)}{\delta v^{\beta b}(y)}\\
= \quad & +iG_R^{ac}(x,y)\Big(\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y^\beta}\epsilon^{cbd}-\underline{v}^{ce}_\beta(y)\epsilon^{ebd}\Big)\pi^d(y)\\
& +iG_R^{ac}(x,y)\underline{a}^{cb}_\beta(y)\hat{\sigma}(y)\\
& +\int d^4x'G_R^{ac}(x,x')\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu-J/f_\pi\Big)^c(x')\ R^*\Big[\hat{\sigma}(x'),\mathbf{j}^b_{V\beta}(y)\Big]\\
& +\frac{i}{f_\pi}G_R^{ac}(x,y)\epsilon^{cbd}\Big(\mathbf{j}^d_{A\beta}(y)-f_\pi\nabla^{de}_\beta(y)\pi^e(y)\Big)\\
& -\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4x'G_R^{ac}(x,x')\Big(\nabla^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^d_{A\alpha}(x'),\mathbf{j}^b_{V\beta}(y)\Big]\\
& +\underline{a}^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^d_{V\alpha}(x'),\mathbf{j}^b_{V\beta}(y)\Big]\Big)
\end{aligned}
\tag{372}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
R^*\Big[\pi^a(x),\hat{\sigma}(y)\Big] = \quad & -\frac{i}{f_\pi}\frac{\delta\pi^a(x)}{\delta s(y)}\\
= \quad & -\frac{i}{f_\pi}G_R^{ac}(x,y)\pi^c(y)\\
& +\int d^4x'G_R^{ac}(x,x')\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu-J/f_\pi\Big)^c(x')\ R^*\Big[\hat{\sigma}(x'),\hat{\sigma}(y)\Big]\\
& -\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4x'G_R^{ac}(x,x')\Big(\nabla^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^d_{A\alpha}(x'),\hat{\sigma}(y)\Big]\\
& +\underline{a}^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^d_{V\alpha}(x'),\hat{\sigma}(y)\Big]\Big)
\end{aligned}
\tag{373}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
R^*\Big[\pi^a(x),\pi^b(y)\Big] = \quad & -i\frac{\delta\pi^a(x)}{\delta J^b(y)}\\
= \quad & +iG_R^{ac}(x,y)+\frac{i}{f_\pi}G_R^{ab}(x,y)\hat{\sigma}(y)\\
& +\int d^4x'G_R^{ac}(x,x')\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu-J/f_\pi\Big)^c(x')\ R^*\Big[\hat{\sigma}(x'),\pi^b(y)\Big]\\
& -\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4x'G_R^{ac}(x,x')\Big(\nabla^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^d_{A\alpha}(x'),\pi^b(y)\Big]
\end{aligned}
$$

$$+\underline{a}^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^d_{V\alpha}(x'),\pi^b(y)\Big]\Big) \tag{374}$$

which are consistent with causality.

On the other hand, the advanced version of (89) and (103) allow us to calculate the full commutators. We may write (103) as

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_{\rm out} = \quad & +\pi_{\rm in} + \tilde{G}\mathbf{K}\pi_{\rm in} \\ & -\tilde{G}J + \tilde{G}\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)\hat{\sigma} \\ & -\frac{1}{f_\pi}\tilde{G}\Big(\nabla^\mu \mathbf{j}_{A\mu} + \underline{a}^\mu \mathbf{j}_{V\mu}\Big)\end{aligned} \tag{375}$$

where

$$\tilde{G} = \Big(1 + G_A\mathbf{K}\Big)^{-1} G = \Delta\Big(1 + \mathbf{K}G_R\Big) \tag{376}$$

$$G = G_R - G_A. \tag{377}$$

Noting that

$$\delta\tilde{G} = \tilde{G}(\delta\mathbf{K})G_R \tag{378}$$

we find

$$\begin{aligned}\Big[\pi_{\rm out}, \hat{\mathcal{S}}^\dagger\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}\Big] = \quad & \delta\pi_{\rm out} \\ = \quad & +\tilde{G}\Big(\delta\mathbf{K}\Big)\pi - \tilde{G}\delta J + \tilde{G}\Big(\nabla^\mu\delta a_\mu + \delta\underline{v}^\mu a_\mu - \delta J/f_\pi\Big)\hat{\sigma} \\ & +\tilde{G}\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J\Big)\delta\hat{\sigma} \\ & -\frac{1}{f_\pi}\tilde{G}\Big(\delta\underline{v}^\mu\mathbf{j}_{A\mu} + \delta\underline{a}^\mu\mathbf{j}_{V\mu} + \nabla^\mu\delta\mathbf{j}_{A\mu} + \underline{a}^\mu\delta\mathbf{j}_{V\mu}\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{379}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\Big[\pi^a(x), \mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y)\Big] = \quad & +iG^{ac}(x,y)\underline{a}^{cd}_\beta(y)\epsilon^{dbe}\pi^e(y) + i\nabla^{bc}_\beta(y)\Big(G^{ac}(x,y)\hat{\sigma}(y)\Big) \\ & +\int d^4x' G^{ac}_R(x,x')\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^c(x')\ R^*\Big[\hat{\sigma}(x'), \mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y)\Big] \\ & -\int d^4x' G^{ac}_A(x,x')\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^c(x')\ R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y), \hat{\sigma}(x')\Big]\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi}G^{ac}(x,y)\epsilon^{cbd}\Big(\mathbf{j}^d_{V\beta}(y)+f_\pi\underline{a}^{de}_\beta(y)\pi^e(y)\Big)\\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4x'G^{ac}_R(x,x')\Big(\nabla^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^d_{A\alpha}(x'),\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y)\Big]\\
&+\underline{a}^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^d_{V\alpha}(x'),\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y)\Big]\Big)\\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4x'G^{ac}_A(x,x')\Big(\nabla^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y),\mathbf{j}^d_{A\alpha}(x')\Big]\\
&+\underline{a}^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y),\mathbf{j}^d_{V\alpha}(x')\Big]\Big)
\end{aligned}
\tag{380}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Big[\pi^a(x),\mathbf{j}^b_{V\beta}(y)\Big]= \quad &+iG^{ac}(x,y)\Big(\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y^\beta}\epsilon^{cbd}-\underline{v}^{ce}_\beta(y)\epsilon^{ebd}\Big)\pi^d(y)\\
&+iG^{ac}(x,y)\underline{a}^{cb}_\beta(y)\hat{\sigma}(y)\\
&+\int d^4x'G^{ac}_R(x,x')\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu-J/f_\pi\Big)^c(x')\ R^*\Big[\hat{\sigma}(x'),\mathbf{j}^b_{V\beta}(y)\Big]\\
&-\int d^4x'G^{ac}_A(x,x')\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu-J/f_\pi\Big)^c(x')\ R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^b_{V\beta}(y),\hat{\sigma}(x')\Big]\\
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi}G^{ac}(x,y)\epsilon^{cbd}\Big(\mathbf{j}^d_{A\beta}(y)-f_\pi\nabla^{de}_\beta(y)\pi^e(y)\Big)\\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4x'G^{ac}_R(x,x')\Big(\nabla^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^d_{A\alpha}(x'),\mathbf{j}^b_{V\beta}(y)\Big]\\
&+\underline{a}^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^d_{V\alpha}(x'),\mathbf{j}^b_{V\beta}(y)\Big]\Big)\\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4x'G^{ac}_A(x,x')\Big(\nabla^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^b_{V\beta}(y),\mathbf{j}_{A\alpha}(x')\Big]\\
&+\underline{a}^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^b_{V\beta}(y),\mathbf{j}^d_{V\alpha}(x')\Big]\Big)
\end{aligned}
\tag{381}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Big[\pi^a(x),\hat{\sigma}(y)\Big]= \quad &-\frac{i}{f_\pi}G^{ac}(x,y)\pi^c(y)\\
&+\int d^4x'G^{ac}_R(x,x')\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu-J/f_\pi\Big)^c(x')\ R^*\Big[\hat{\sigma}(x'),\hat{\sigma}(y)\Big]\\
&-\int d^4x'G^{ac}_A(x,x')\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu-J/f_\pi\Big)^c(x')\ R^*\Big[\hat{\sigma}(y),\hat{\sigma}(x')\Big]\\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4x'G^{ac}_R(x,x')\Big(\nabla^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^d_{A\alpha}(x'),\hat{\sigma}(y)\Big]\\
&+\underline{a}^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^d_{V\alpha}(x'),\hat{\sigma}(y)\Big]\Big)\\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4x'G^{ac}_A(x,x')\Big(\nabla^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\hat{\sigma}(y),\mathbf{j}^d_{A\alpha}(x')\Big]
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
+\underline{a}^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\hat{\sigma}(y),\mathbf{j}^d_{V\alpha}(x')\Big]\Big)
\tag{382}
$$

which are consistent with (371-373) as well as locality. The comparison between the two also gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y),\pi^a(x)\Big] = \quad & +iG^{ac}_A(x,y)\underline{a}^{cd}_\beta(y)\epsilon^{dbe}\pi^e(y)+i\nabla^{bc}_\beta(y)\Big(G^{ac}_A(x,y)\hat{\sigma}(y)\Big)\\
&+\int d^4x' G^{ac}_A(x,x')\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^c(x')\ R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y),\hat{\sigma}(x')\Big]\\
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi}G^{ac}_A(x,y)\epsilon^{cbd}\Big(\mathbf{j}^b_{V\beta}(y)+f_\pi\underline{a}^{de}_\beta(y)\pi^e(y)\Big)\\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4x' G^{ac}_A(x,x')\Big(\nabla^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y),\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(x')\Big]\\
&+\underline{a}^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y),\mathbf{j}^d_{V\alpha}(x')\Big]\Big)
\end{aligned}
\tag{383}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^b_{V\beta}(y),\pi^a(x)\Big] = \quad & +iG^{ac}_A(x,y)\Big(\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y^\beta}\epsilon^{cbd}-\underline{v}^{ce}_\beta(y)\epsilon^{ebd}\Big)\pi^d(y)\\
&+iG^{ac}_A(x,y)\underline{a}^{cb}_\beta(y)\hat{\sigma}(y)\\
&+\int d^4x' G^{ac}_A(x,x')\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^c(x')\ R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^b_{V\beta}(y),\hat{\sigma}(x')\Big]\\
&+\frac{i}{f_\pi}G^{ac}_A(x,y)\epsilon^{cbd}\Big(\mathbf{j}^d_{A\beta}(y)-f_\pi\nabla^{de}_\beta(y)\pi^e(y)\Big)\\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4x' G^{ac}_A(x,x')\Big(\nabla^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^b_{V\beta}(y),\mathbf{j}^d_{A\alpha}(x')\Big]\\
&+\underline{a}^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}^b_{V\beta}(y),\mathbf{j}^d_{V\alpha}(x')\Big]\Big)
\end{aligned}
\tag{384}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Big[\hat{\sigma}(y),\pi^a(x)\Big] = \quad & -\frac{i}{f_\pi}G^{ac}_A(x,y)\pi^c(y)\\
&+\int d^4x' G^{ac}_A(x,x')\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^c(x')\ R^*\Big[\hat{\sigma}(y),\hat{\sigma}(x')\Big]\\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4x' G^{ac}_A(x,x')\Big(\nabla^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\hat{\sigma}(y),\mathbf{j}^d_{A\alpha}(x')\Big]\\
&+\underline{a}^{\alpha cd}(x')R^*\Big[\hat{\sigma}(y),\mathbf{j}^d_{V\alpha}(x')\Big]\Big).
\end{aligned}
\tag{385}
$$

With some further work, we also find

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Big[\pi^a(x),\pi^b(y)\Big] = \quad & +iG_R^{ac}(x,y) - \frac{i}{f_\pi}\int d^4z G_R^{ac}(x,z)\pi^c(z)G_A^{bd}(y,z)\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^d(z) \\
& + \int d^4x' d^4y' G_R^{ac}(x,x')\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^c(x') \\
& G_A^{bd}(y,y')\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^d(y')R^*\Big[\hat\sigma(x'),\hat\sigma(y')\Big] \\
& -\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4x' d^4y' G_R^{ac}G_A^{bd}(y,y')\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^d(y') \\
& \times\Big(\nabla^{\alpha ce}R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}_{A\alpha}^e(x'),\hat\sigma(y')\Big] + \underline{a}_\alpha^{ce}(x')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}_{V\alpha}^e(x'),\hat\sigma(y')\Big]\Big) \\
& -\frac{i}{f_\pi}\int d^4z G_A^{bd}(y,z)\nabla^{\alpha de}(z)\Big(G_R^{ac}(x,z)\underline{a}_\alpha^{cf}(z)\epsilon^{feg}\pi^g(z)\Big) \\
& -\frac{i}{f_\pi}\int d^4z G_A^{bd}(y,z)(\nabla^\alpha\nabla_\alpha)^{dc}(z)\Big(G_R^{ac}(x,z)\hat\sigma(z)\Big) \\
& -\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4x' d^4y' G_R^{ac}\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^c(x')G_A^{bd}(y,y') \\
& \times\Big(\nabla^{\alpha de}R^*\Big[\hat\sigma(x'),\mathbf{j}_{A\alpha}^e(y')\Big] + \underline{a}_\alpha^{de}(x')R^*\Big[\hat\sigma(y'),\mathbf{j}_{V\alpha}^e(y')\Big]\Big) \\
& -\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4z G_A^{bd}(y,z)\nabla^{\alpha de}(z)\Big(G_R^{ac}(x,z)\epsilon^{cef}\Big(\mathbf{j}_{V\alpha}^f(z) + f_\pi\underline{a}_\alpha^{fg}(z)\pi^g(z)\Big)\Big) \\
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4x' d^4y' G_R^{ac}(x,x')G_A^{bd}(y,y') \\
& \Big(\nabla^{\alpha ce}(x')\nabla^{\beta df}(y')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}_{A\alpha}^e(x'),\mathbf{j}_{A\beta}^f(y')\Big] \\
& +\underline{a}^{\alpha ce}(x')\nabla^{\beta df}(y')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}_{A\alpha}^e(x'),\mathbf{j}_{V\beta}^f(y')\Big] \\
& +\nabla^{\alpha ce}(x')\underline{a}^{\beta df}(y')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}_{A\alpha}^e(x'),\mathbf{j}_{V\beta}^f(y')\Big] \\
& +\underline{a}^{\alpha ce}(x')\underline{a}^{\beta df}(y')R^*\Big[\mathbf{j}_{V\alpha}^e(x'),\mathbf{j}_{V\beta}^f(y')\Big]\Big) \\
& -\frac{i}{f_\pi}\int d^4z G_A^{bd}(y,z)\underline{a}^{\alpha de}(z)\Big(G_R^{ac}(x,z)\Big(\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial z^\alpha}\epsilon^{cef} - \underline{v}_\alpha^{cg}(z)\epsilon^{gef}\Big)\pi^f(z)\Big) \\
& +\frac{i}{f_\pi}\int d^4z G_R^{ac}(x,z)G_A^{bd}(y,z)(\underline{a}^\alpha\underline{a}_\alpha)^{cd}(z)\hat\sigma(z) \\
& -\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4z G_R^{ac}(x,z)G_A^{bd}(y,z)\underline{a}^{\alpha de}(z)\epsilon^{cef}\Big(\mathbf{j}_{A\alpha}^f(z) - f_\pi\nabla_\alpha^{fg}(z)\pi^g(z)\Big) \\
& +\frac{i}{f_\pi}G_R^{ab}(x,y)\hat\sigma(x) - \Big(x\ a\leftrightarrow y\ b\Big) \qquad (386)
\end{aligned}
$$

from (89) and (379), which may be checked to be consistent with (374) and (383-385).

Time-ordered products may be also computed from

$$T^*\Big(\pi^a(x)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y)\Big) = R^*\Big[\pi^a(x), \mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y)\Big] + \mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y)\pi^a(x) \tag{387}$$

and so on. The results coincide with (92-95).

Another type of commutator appears in connection with integrability. We may define

$$\begin{aligned}\Upsilon_R\mathcal{O} = \quad & \frac{\delta\mathcal{O}}{\delta J} - i\mathcal{O}\Big(1+G_R\mathbf{K}\Big)\pi_{\rm in} + iG_RJ\mathcal{O} \\ & -\frac{1}{f_\pi}G_R\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)\frac{\delta\mathcal{O}}{\delta s} + \frac{1}{f_\pi}G_R\mathbf{X}_A\mathcal{O}\end{aligned} \tag{388}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Upsilon_A\mathcal{O} = \quad & \frac{\delta\mathcal{O}}{\delta J} - i\Big(1+G_R\mathbf{K}\Big)\pi_{\rm in}\mathcal{O} + iG_AJ\mathcal{O} \\ & -\frac{1}{f_\pi}G_A\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)\frac{\delta\mathcal{O}}{\delta s} + \frac{1}{f_\pi}G_A\mathbf{X}_A\mathcal{O}\end{aligned} \tag{389}$$

for a general operator $\mathcal{O}$. With some further work, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\Big[\Upsilon^a_R(x), \Upsilon^b_R(y)\Big]\ \mathcal{O} = \quad & i\Big(\frac{\delta}{\delta J^a(x)}\int d^4y' G^{bd}_R(y,y')J^d(y')\Big)\mathcal{O} \\ & -\frac{1}{f_\pi}\Big(\frac{\delta}{\delta J^a(x)}\int d^4y' G^{bd}_R(y,y')\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^d(y')\Big)\frac{\delta\mathcal{O}}{\delta s(y')} \\ & +i\frac{1}{f_\pi}\mathcal{O}\int d^4x' G^{ac}_R(x,x')\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^c(x') \\ & \frac{\delta}{\delta s(x')}\int d^4y'\, G^{bd}_R(y,y')\mathbf{K}^{de}(y')\pi^e_{\rm in}(y') \\ & -\frac{i}{f_\pi}\int d^4x' G^{ac}_R(x,x')\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^c(x') \\ & \times\Big(\frac{\delta}{\delta s(x')}\int d^4y' G^{bd}_R(y,y')J^d(y')\Big)\mathcal{O} \\ & +\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}\int d^4x' G^{ac}_R(x,x')\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^c(x') \\ & \times\Big(\frac{\delta}{\delta s(x')}\int d^4y' G^{bd}_R(y,y')\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^d(y')\Big)\frac{\delta\mathcal{O}}{\delta s(y')} \\ & -\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4x' G^{ac}_R(x,x')\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^c(x') \\ & \times\Big(\frac{\delta}{\delta s(x')}\int d^4y' G^{bd}_R(y,y')\mathbf{X}^d_A(y')\Big)\mathcal{O} \\ & -\frac{i}{f_\pi}\mathcal{O}\int d^4x' G^{ac}_R(x,x')\mathbf{X}^c_A(x')\int d^4y' G^{bd}_R(y,y')\mathbf{K}^{de}(y')\pi^e_{\rm in}(y') \\ & +\frac{i}{f_\pi}\int d^4x' G^{ac}_R(x,x')\Big(\mathbf{X}^c_A(x')\int d^4y' G^{bd}_R(y,y')J^d(y')\Big)\mathcal{O}\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4x' G_R^{ac}(x,x')\Big(\mathbf{X}_A^c(x')\int d^4y' G_R^{bd}(y,y') \\
& \times\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^d(y')\Big)\frac{\delta\mathcal{O}}{\delta s(y')} \\
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4x' G_R^{ac}(x,x')\Big(\mathbf{X}_A^c(x')\int d^4y' G_R^{bd}(y,y')\Big)\mathbf{X}_A^d(y')\mathcal{O} \\
& -\Big(x\ a \leftrightarrow y\ b\Big) \\
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4x' d^4y' G_R^{ac}(x,x')G_R^{bd}(y,y')\Big[\mathbf{X}_A^c(x'),\mathbf{X}_A^d(y')\Big]\mathcal{O} \\
& -\mathcal{O}\Big[\Big(1+G_R\mathbf{K}\Big)^{bd}\pi_{\rm in}^d(y),\Big(1+G_R\mathbf{K}\Big)^{ac}\pi_{\rm in}^c(y)\Big] \\
= \quad & \frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4z G_R^{ac}(x,z)G_R^{bd}(y,z)\Big(J^c(z)\Upsilon_R^d(z)\mathcal{O} \\
& -J^d(z)\Upsilon_R^c(z)\mathcal{O} - \epsilon^{cde}\Big(\mathbf{X}_V^e(z) + \underline{J}^{ef}(z)\frac{\delta}{\delta J^f(z)}\Big)\mathcal{O}\Big). \qquad (390)
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big[\Upsilon_A^a(x),\Upsilon_A^b(y)\Big] = \quad & +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4z G_A^{ac}(x,z)G_A^{bd}(y,z)\Big(J^c(z)\Upsilon_A^d(z)\mathcal{O} \\
& -J^d(z)\Upsilon_A^c(z)\mathcal{O} - \epsilon^{cde}\Big(\mathbf{X}_V^e(z) + \underline{J}^{ef}(z)\frac{\delta}{\delta J^f(z)}\Big)\mathcal{O}\Big) \qquad (391)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big[\Upsilon_R^a(x),\Upsilon_A^b(y)\Big] = \quad & -\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4z G_R^{ac}(x,z)G_A^{bd}(y,z)\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^c(z)\Upsilon_A^d(z)\mathcal{O} \\
& -\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4z G_R^{ac}(x,z)\nabla_\mu^{cf}(z) \\
& \times\Big(G_A^{bd}(y,z)\Big(\epsilon^{dfg}\underline{a}^{\mu ge} + \underline{a}^{\mu dg}(z)\epsilon^{gfe}\Big)\Upsilon_A^e(z)\mathcal{O}\Big) \\
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4z G_R^{ac}(x,z)\underline{a}_\mu^{cf}(z)G_A^{bd}(y,z)\epsilon^{dfg}\nabla^{\mu ge}(z)\Upsilon_A^e(z)\mathcal{O} \\
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4z G_R^{ac}(x,z)\underline{a}_\mu^{cf}(z)\Upsilon_A^e(z)\mathcal{O}\epsilon^{efg}\nabla^{\mu gd}(z)G_A^{bd}(y,z) \\
& -\Big(x\ ,a\ ,R \leftrightarrow y\ ,b\ ,A\Big) \\
& -\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4z G_R^{ac}(x,z)G_A^{bd}(y,z)\epsilon^{cde} \\
& \times\Big(\mathbf{X}_V^e(z) + \underline{J}^{ef}(z)\frac{\delta}{\delta J^f(z)}\Big)\mathcal{O}. \qquad (392)
\end{aligned}$$

We may also check that

$$\Big[\mathbf{X}_V^a(x) + \underline{J}^{ac}(x)\frac{\delta}{\delta J^c(x)},\Upsilon_{R,A}^b(y)\Big] = -\epsilon^{abc}\delta^4(x-y)\Upsilon_{R,A}^c(y). \qquad (393)$$

The eqns. (351, 390-393) imply that the master equations (53, 90) constitute an integrable system. It follows that the solutions of (53,103) can be consistently extended to solutions of (53,90). Since the space of external fields and Fock space of $\pi_{\rm in}$ is topologically trivial, there should be no global obstruction. Eqns. (371-374, 380-382) then guarantee that causality and locality are duly maintained.

The linear character of the master formula is further emphasized if we introduce coherent states,

$$\begin{aligned}
a^a_{\rm in}(k)|\alpha \text{ in }>= &\quad \alpha^a(k)|\alpha\text{ in }> \\
a^{a\dagger}_{\rm in}(k)|\alpha\text{ in }>= &\quad (2\pi)^3 2k^0\frac{\delta}{\delta\alpha^a(k)}|\alpha\text{ in }> \\
<\beta\text{ in}|a^{\dagger a}_{\rm in}(k) = &\quad <\beta\text{ in}|\beta^{a*}(k) \\
<\beta\text{ in}|a^{a}_{\rm in}(k) = &\quad (2\pi)^3 2k^0\frac{\delta}{\delta\beta^{a*}(k)}<\beta\text{ in}|.
\end{aligned}\tag{394}$$

The master formula (90) then reads

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\delta}{\delta J^a(x)}<\beta\text{ in}|\hat{\mathcal{S}}|\alpha\text{ in }> \\
&-i\int d^3k\int d^4y e^{ik\cdot y}\Big(1+G_R\mathbf{K}\Big)^{ab}(x,y)\frac{\delta}{\delta\alpha^a(k)}<\beta\text{ in}|\hat{\mathcal{S}}|\alpha\text{ in }> \\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4y G^{ab}_R(x,y)\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^b(y)\frac{\delta}{\delta s(x)}<\beta\text{ in}|\hat{\mathcal{S}}|\alpha\text{ in }> \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4y G^{ab}_R(x,y)\mathbf{X}^b_A(y)<\beta\text{ in}|\hat{\mathcal{S}}|\alpha\text{ in }> -\theta^a_R(x)<\beta\text{ in}|\hat{\mathcal{S}}|\alpha\text{ in }>=0
\end{aligned}\tag{395}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta^a_R(x) = &\quad +i\int d^4y\Big(1+G_R\mathbf{K}\Big)^{ab}(x,y)\Big(\frac{1}{(2\pi)^3}\int\frac{d^3k}{2k^0}\alpha^b(k)e^{-ik\cdot y}\Big) \\
&\quad -i\int d^4y G^{ab}_R(x,y)J^b(y)
\end{aligned}\tag{396}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\delta}{\delta J^a(x)}<\beta\text{ in}|\hat{\mathcal{S}}|\alpha\text{ in }> \\
&-i\int d^3k\int d^4y e^{-ik\cdot y}\Big(1+G_A\mathbf{K}\Big)^{ab}(x,y)\frac{\delta}{\delta\beta^{a*}(k)}<\beta\text{ in}|\hat{\mathcal{S}}|\alpha\text{ in }> \\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4y\; G^{ab}_A(x,y)\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^b(y)\frac{\delta}{\delta s(x)}<\beta\text{ in}|\hat{\mathcal{S}}|\alpha\text{ in }> \\
&+\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4y\; G^{ab}_A(x,y)\mathbf{X}^b_A(y)<\beta\text{ in}|\hat{\mathcal{S}}|\alpha\text{ in }> -\theta^a_A(x)<\beta\text{ in}|\hat{\mathcal{S}}|\alpha\text{ in }>=0
\end{aligned}\tag{397}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\theta^a_A(x) = \quad & +i\int d^4y\Big(1+G_A\mathbf{K}\Big)^{ab}(x,y)\Big(\frac{1}{(2\pi)^3}\int\frac{d^3k}{2k^0}\beta^{b*}(k)e^{+ik\cdot y}\Big)\\ & -i\int d^4yG^{ab}_A(x,y)J^b(y). \end{aligned}\qquad (398)$$

These equations can be solved as usual by introducing characteristics. For the retarded equations (395-396)

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dJ^b(y,\tau)}{d\tau} &= \quad +\delta^4(x-y)\delta^{ab}\\ \frac{d\alpha^b(k,\tau)}{d\tau} &= \quad -i\int d^4ye^{+ik\cdot y}\Big(1+G_R\mathbf{K}\Big)^{ab}(x,y,\tau)\\ \frac{ds(y,\tau)}{d\tau} &= \quad -\frac{1}{f_\pi}G^{ab}_R(x,y,\tau)\Big(\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi\Big)^b(y,\tau)\\ \frac{da^c_\mu(y,\tau)}{d\tau} &= \quad +\frac{1}{f_\pi}G^{ab}_R(x,y,\tau)\Big(-\frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial y^\mu}\delta^{bc}+\underline{v}^{bc}_\mu(y,\tau)\Big)\\ \frac{dv^c_\mu(y,\tau)}{d\tau} &= \quad +G^{ab}_R(x,y,\tau)\underline{a}^{bc}_\mu(y,\tau)\end{aligned}\qquad (399)$$

where x and a are fixed, and $G_R(x,y,\tau)$ means that s, a^a_μ and v^a_μ in $G_R(x,y)$ are replaced by their running values. The master formula then simplifies to

$$<\beta\ \text{in}|\hat{\mathcal{S}}[\tau_1]|\alpha[\tau_1]\ \text{in}>=<\beta\ \text{in}|\hat{\mathcal{S}}[\tau_0]|\alpha[\tau_0]\ \text{in}>\exp\Big(\int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_1}d\tau\theta^a_R(x,\tau)\Big)\qquad (400)$$

and a similar relation for the advanced version. So far, we have been unable to extract practical information from (399), even though it is a system of ordinary differential equations. This is to be contrasted with the nonlinear partial differential equation for operator-valued distributions we started from. Another open issue regarding this formulation is whether any useful information could be extracted in the classical limit.

Appendix E : General Analysis of One-Loop Effects

Let us consider the phase change in the S-matrix $\hat{\mathcal{S}}\to\hat{\mathcal{S}}e^{i\alpha}$, where α may depend on the external fields $\phi=(v,a,s,J)$. Substitution into the causality condition

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta\phi(y)}\Big(\hat{\mathcal{S}}^\dagger\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}}{\delta\phi(x)}\Big)=0\qquad (x\preceq y)\qquad (401)$$

gives

$$\frac{\delta^2\alpha}{\delta\phi(y)\delta\phi(x)}=0\qquad (x\preceq y).\qquad (402)$$

By symmetry

$$\frac{\delta^2\alpha}{\delta\phi(y)\delta\phi(x)} = 0 \qquad x \neq y \tag{403}$$

There are two types of solutions to (403). One is a constant plus linear terms in ϕ. The constant may be eliminated by the normalization $< 0|\mathbf{S}|0 >= 1$. Terms linear in v, a, J are forbidden by isospin, whereas translation invariance requires the term linear in s to be of the form

$$\int d^4x\, s(x). \tag{404}$$

The other type of solution is

$$\int d^4x\, P(x) \tag{405}$$

where $P(x)$ is a polynomial in $\phi(x)$ and its derivatives. (404) may then be absorbed into this case. We also note that the space of ϕ is topologically trivial, so there should be no Wess-Zumino type terms which require extra coordinates.

The J dependence is fixed by the master equation (90), so we may set $J = 0$. We further assume that the theory contains only two scales f_π and m_π, which should be the case for QCD with two flavors. Then the P's with mass dimension 5 or higher in ϕ and its derivatives will be accompanied by powers of $1/f_\pi$ times some dimensionless function $h(m_\pi/f_\pi)$. The existence of the chiral limit requires $h(0)$ to be finite, so such terms belong to higher order in the loop expansion.

The analysis must be modified for QCD with three flavors or the linear sigma model, which contain an extra mass scale m_K or m_σ. However, if we assume that the theory is finite as m_K/f_π or $g = m_\sigma^2/2f_\pi^2$ go to zero, the same conclusion applies. It is also possible that the theory contains a heavy scale M. In that case, we assume that the amplitudes can be expanded in p/f_π, f_π/M and p/M, where p stands for a typical momentum or a light mass. If the latter two terms can be ignored, we are back to the same result.

Let us apply our results to $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0$. Substitution of $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0 \to \hat{\mathcal{S}}_0 e^{i\alpha}$ into (235), gives $\delta\alpha/\delta J = 0$, in agreement with the explicit representation (236). As we have seen, it is then sufficient to consider P's with dimension 4 or less in $\phi = (v, a, s)$ and its derivatives. Besides local isospin invariance $\mathbf{X}_V\alpha = 0$, G-parity requires a_μ^a to appear in even powers, and parity forbids the use of the Levi-Civita $\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$.

There are no terms with three or four derivatives. Ignoring total divergences, there are three terms with two derivatives

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{c_1}{4} v^{\mu\nu} \cdot v_{\mu\nu} \\ & +\frac{c_2}{2} (\nabla^\mu a^\nu) \cdot (\nabla_\mu a_\nu) \\ & +\frac{c_3}{2} (\nabla^\mu a_\mu)^2 \end{aligned} \tag{406}$$

since the other combination

$$+ (\nabla^\mu a^\nu)(\nabla_\nu a_\mu) \tag{407}$$

reduces to the last term of (406) and (408) below up to a total divergence. There is essentially one term with one derivative

$$+ \frac{c_4}{2} \epsilon^{abc} v^a_{\mu\nu} a^{\mu b} a^{\nu c} \tag{408}$$

and six terms with no derivatives

$$\begin{aligned} & +\frac{c_5}{4} (a_\mu \cdot a^\mu)^2 \quad , \\ & +\frac{c_6}{4} (a_\mu \cdot a_\nu)(a^\mu \cdot a^\nu) \quad , \\ & +\frac{c_7}{2} s a_\mu \cdot a^\mu \quad , \\ & +\frac{c_8}{2} s^2 \quad , \\ & +\frac{c_9}{2} m_\pi^2 a_\mu \cdot a^\mu \quad , \\ & +c_{10} m_\pi^2 s \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{409}$$

The results of section 18 imply that , $< 0|\hat{\sigma}|0 >$, $< 0|T^*(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(x)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y))|0 >$ and $< 0|T^*(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(x)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y)\mathbf{V}^c_\gamma(z))|0 >$ at one-loop level are given entirely by the contact terms above. Specifically,

$$< 0|\hat{\sigma}|0 >= c_{10} \frac{m_\pi^2}{f_\pi} \tag{410}$$

$$\begin{aligned} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(x)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y)\Big)|0 >= \quad & +ic_2 \delta^{ab}\, g_{\alpha\beta} \Box \delta^4(x-y) \\ & +ic_3 \delta^{ab} \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta \delta^4(x-y) \\ & -ic_9 \delta^{ab} g_{\alpha\beta} m_\pi^2 \delta^4(x-y) \end{aligned} \tag{411}$$

$$< 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(x)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y)\mathbf{V}^c_\gamma(z)\Big)|0 >= \quad \begin{aligned}&+c_2\epsilon^{abc}g_{\alpha\beta}\delta^4(x-z)\partial_\gamma\delta^4(y-z)\\ &+c_3\epsilon^{abc}g_{\alpha\gamma}\delta^4(x-z)\partial_\beta\delta^4(y-z)\\ &+c_4\epsilon^{abc}g_{\alpha\gamma}\delta^4(x-y)\partial_\beta\delta^4(y-z)\\ &+\Big(x,\alpha,a\rightarrow y,\beta,b\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{412}$$

Substitution of (410-411) into (112-113) gives

$$c_{10} = c_2 + c_3 + c_9 \tag{413}$$

while substitution into (190-191) gives

$$\mathbf{F}_V(t) = 1 - \frac{m_\pi^2}{f_\pi^2}c_9 + \frac{t}{2f_\pi^2}\Big(c_4 - c_2 + \mathbf{\Pi}_V(t)\Big) + \mathcal{O}\Big(\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}\Big). \tag{414}$$

The normalization condition $\mathbf{F}_V(0) = 1$ requires[6]

$$c_9 = 0. \tag{415}$$

Combining with (282) then gives

$$\mathbf{F}_V(t) = 1 + \frac{t}{2f_\pi^2}\Big((c_4+2c_1) - (c_2+c_1) + \frac{1}{3}(1-\frac{4m_\pi^2}{t})\mathcal{J}(t) + \frac{1}{72\pi^2}\Big) + \mathcal{O}\Big(\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}\Big). \tag{416}$$

Substitution of (410-412) into (207) also yields

$$\frac{1}{f_\pi}\Big((c_4+2c_1) - 2(c_2+c_1)\Big)\Big(p\cdot q\epsilon_\nu(q) - \epsilon(q)\cdot pq_\nu\Big) + \mathcal{O}\Big(\frac{1}{f_\pi^3}\Big). \tag{417}$$

We may also compute other quantities. From (81)

$$< 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{A}^a_\mu(x)\mathbf{A}^b_\nu(y)\Big)|0 >= \quad \begin{aligned}&-if_\pi^2\delta^4(x-y)g_{\mu\nu}\delta^{ab}\\ &+ < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\mu}(x)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\nu}(y)\Big)|0 >\\ &-f_\pi\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} < 0|T^*\Big(\pi^a(x)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\nu}(y)\Big)|0 >\\ &-f_\pi\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\nu} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\mu}(x)\pi^b(y)\Big)|0 >\\ &+f_\pi^2\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\nu} < 0|T^*\Big(\pi^a(x)\pi^b(y)\Big)|0 >\end{aligned} \tag{418}$$

---

[6] It is not clear to us, however, why c_9 manages to violate $\mathbf{F}_V(0) = 1$.

and from (92)

$$
\begin{aligned}
&< 0|T^*\Big(\pi^a(x)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\nu}(y)\Big)|0 >= i\delta^{ab}\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\nu}\Delta_R(x-y) < 0|\hat\sigma|0 > \\
&-\frac{1}{f_\pi}\int d^4x'\Delta_R(x-x')\frac{\partial}{\partial x'_\alpha} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\mu}(x')\mathbf{j}^b_{A\nu}(y)\Big)|0 > . \qquad (419)
\end{aligned}
$$

Also from (92,95) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
< 0|T^*\Big(\pi^a(x)\pi^b(y)\Big)|0 >= \quad & +i\delta^{ab}\Delta_F(x-y) + \frac{2i}{f_\pi}\delta^{ab}\Delta_R(x-y) < 0|\hat\sigma|0 > \\
& +\frac{i}{f_\pi}m_\pi^2\delta^{ab}\int d^4x'\Delta_R(x-x')\Delta_A(y-x') < 0|\hat\sigma|0 > \\
& +\frac{i}{f_\pi^2}\int d^4x'd^4y'\Delta_R(x-x')\Delta_A(y-y') \\
& \times\frac{\partial}{\partial x'_\alpha}\frac{\partial}{\partial y'_\beta} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(x')\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y')\Big)|0 > . \qquad (420)
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
&i\int d^4x e^{ip\cdot(x-y)} < 0|T^*\Big(\pi^a(x)\pi^b(y)\Big)|0 >= \\
&-\delta^{ab}\frac{1}{p^2-m_\pi^2+i0} + \frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\delta^{ab}(c_2+c_3) + \mathcal{O}\Big(\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}\Big) \qquad (421)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&i\int d^4x e^{ip\cdot(x-y)} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{A}^a_\mu(x)\mathbf{A}^b_\nu(y)\Big)|0 >= +f_\pi^2 g_{\mu\nu}\delta^{ab} \\
&-f_\pi^2\delta^{ab}\,p_\mu p_\nu\frac{1}{p^2-m_\pi^2+i0} - c_2\delta^{ab}\Big(-g_{\mu\nu}p^2 + p_\mu p_\nu\Big) + \mathcal{O}\Big(\frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\Big). \qquad (422)
\end{aligned}
$$

The contact term proportional to $f_\pi^2 g_{\mu\nu}\delta^{ab}$ in (418,422) deserves some comment. The appearance of such a term is natural in the gauged nonlinear sigma model where the action is quadratic in a^a_μ, so that $\mathbf{A}^a_\mu$ contains a term proportional to a^a_μ,

$$
\mathbf{A}^a_\mu(x) = f_\pi^2 a^a_\mu(x) + \dots . \qquad (423)
$$

However, the appearance of such a term is rather surprising for QCD, where the action is nominally linear in a^a_μ. Nevertheless such a term must appear if QCD does what it is supposed to do, namely generate pions. In particular, the Ward identity in the chiral limit (31) implies

$$
i\int d^4x e^{ip\cdot(x-y)} < 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{A}^a_\mu(x)\mathbf{A}^b_\nu(y)\Big)|0 >= f_\pi^2\delta^{ab}\Big(g_{\mu\nu} - \frac{p_\mu p_\nu}{p^2+i0}\Big) + \dots . \qquad (424)
$$

We observe that while the problem is related to the short distance behavior of the time-ordered product, it cannot be seen in perturbative QCD, since dimensional transmutation implies that $f_\pi \sim \mu e^{-1/g^2}$, where μ is the renormalization scale and g is the QCD coupling constant.

To come back to the main issue, we note that two parameters are *off shell* in the following sense. The master formulas (53) and (90) are invariant under $\hat{\mathcal{S}} \to \hat{\mathcal{S}} e^{i\alpha}$, if α is a linear combination of

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{c_1}{8}\int d^4x\Big(F_{L\mu\nu}\cdot F_L^{\mu\nu} + F_{R\mu\nu}\cdot F_R^{\mu\nu}\Big) = \\
&-\frac{c_1}{4}\int d^4x\Big(v_{\mu\nu}\cdot v^{\mu\nu} + (\nabla^\mu a^\nu - \nabla^\nu a^\mu)\cdot(\nabla_\mu a_\nu - \nabla_\nu a_\mu) \\
&+\epsilon^{abc}\epsilon^{ade}a_\mu^b a_\nu^c a^{\mu d}a^{\nu e} + 2\epsilon^{abc}v_{\mu\nu}^a a^{\mu b}a^{\nu c}\Big) = \\
&-\frac{c_1}{4}\int d^4x\Big(v_{\mu\nu}\cdot v^{\mu\nu} + 2(\nabla^\mu a^\nu)\cdot(\nabla_\mu a_\nu) - 2(\nabla^\mu a_\mu)^2 \\
&+\epsilon^{abc}\epsilon^{ade}a_\mu^b a_\nu^c a^{\mu d}a^{\nu e} + 4\epsilon^{abc}v_{\mu\nu}^a a^{\mu b}a^{\nu c}\Big)
\end{aligned} \tag{425}$$

and

$$\frac{c_3 - c_1}{2}\int d^4x\Big(s^2 + 2m_\pi^2 s + (\nabla^\mu a_\mu - J/f_\pi)^2\Big) \tag{426}$$

where $F_{R,L}^{\mu\nu}$ are the field strengths associated with $v_\mu \pm a_\mu$ respectively. Therefore, such a phase redefinition will change the Green's functions only by some polynomials in the momenta, and will not affect on-shell quantities which are given by pole terms. Therefore on-shell quantities can depend only on six parameters, which may be chosen to be

$$c_2 + c_1,\ c_4 + 2c_1,\ c_5 + c_1,\ c_6 - c_1,\ c_7,\ c_8 - (c_3 - c_1). \tag{427}$$

It is easy to see that (416-417) involve only linear combinations of the above. We may note that the result is essentially independent of the high energy behavior of QCD or any other model. The only constraint on the high energy behavior is that it should not destroy the Veltman-Bell equations in the first place.

Comparison of (191, 282) and (413,416,417,421,422) with the corresponding expressions in the work of Gasser and Leutwyler [8] suggests the following identification

$$c_1 + \frac{1}{72\pi^2} \qquad \leftrightarrow \frac{1}{48\pi^2}(\overline{h}_2 - \frac{1}{3})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{10} &\leftrightarrow \frac{1}{8\pi^2}(\overline{h}_1 - \overline{l}_4)\\
c_4 - c_2 + c_1 + \frac{1}{72\pi^2} &\leftrightarrow \frac{1}{48\pi^2}(\overline{l}_6 - \frac{1}{3})\\
c_4 - 2c_2 &\leftrightarrow \frac{1}{48\pi^2}(\overline{l}_6 - \overline{l}_5)\\
c_2 + c_3 &\leftrightarrow \frac{1}{8\pi^2}(\overline{h}_1 - \overline{l}_4)\\
c_2 &\leftrightarrow \frac{1}{48\pi^2}(\overline{l}_5 - \overline{h}_2). \qquad (428)
\end{aligned}$$

The above results are consistent. In particular, we recover a relation between the pion electromagnetic form factor (416), the pion radiative decay $\pi \to e\nu\gamma$ (417) and the difference between the vector and axial-vector correlator

$$< 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{V}^a_\mu(x)\mathbf{V}^b_\nu(y) - \mathbf{A}^a_\mu(x)\mathbf{A}^b_\nu(y)\Big)|0 >$$

as given by (191, 282) and (422). This relation is not necessarily equivalent to the Das-Mathur-Okubo relation [57], since the spectral function for the axial-vector correlator does not have a transverse part at one loop as discussed in 18.3. We believe that this remark applies also to the analysis performed by Gasser and Leutwyler, although it appears to have been stated otherwise [8]. The correspondence also implies that the parameters $c_2 + c_4 + c_1$ and $c_2 + c_1$ involving the vector current $\mathbf{V}^a_\mu(x)$ are relatively large, but the difference is rather small. Numerically,

$$16\pi^2(c_4 - c_2 + c_1) = 32\pi^2 f_\pi^2 \mathbf{F}'_V(0) = 5.17 \pm 0.35 \qquad (429)$$

The radiative decay $\pi \to e\nu\gamma$ gives

$$16\pi^2(c_4 - 2c_2) = 0.88 \pm 0.24 \qquad (430)$$

so that

$$16\pi^2(c_2 + c_1) = 4.29 \pm 0.42 \qquad (431)$$

Let us now consider $\pi\pi$ scattering again. Equations (273-277) are modified to

$$< 0|T^*\Big(\hat\sigma(x)\hat\sigma(y)\Big)|0 >_{\rm conn} = -\frac{3i}{2f_\pi^2}\int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4} e^{-iq\cdot(x-y)}\ \mathcal{J}(q^2) - \frac{i}{f_\pi^2} c_8 \delta^4(x-y) \qquad (432)$$

$$< 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(y_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y_2)\hat{\sigma}(y_3)\Big)|0 >_{\rm conn} = \quad -\frac{2}{f_\pi}g_{\alpha\beta}\delta^4(y_1-y_2)\int\frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4}e^{-iq\cdot(y_1-y_3)}\mathcal{J}(q^2)$$
$$-\frac{1}{f_\pi}c_7\delta^4(y_1-y_3)\delta^4(y_2-y_3)g_{\alpha\beta}\delta^{ab} \qquad (433)$$

$$< 0|T^*\Big(\mathbf{j}^a_{A\alpha}(y_1)\mathbf{j}^b_{A\beta}(y_2)\mathbf{j}^c_{A\gamma}(y_3)\mathbf{j}^d_{A\delta}(y_4)\Big)|0 >_{\rm conn} =$$
$$i\Big(2\delta^{ab}\delta^{cd}+\delta^{ac}\delta^{bd}+\delta^{ab}\delta^{bc}\Big)g_{\alpha\beta}g_{\gamma\delta}$$
$$\times\delta^4(y_1-y_2)\delta^4(y_3-y_4)\int\frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4}e^{-iq\cdot(y_3-y_1)}\mathcal{J}(q^2)$$
$$+\Big(2ic_5g_{\alpha\beta}g_{\gamma\delta}+ic_6g_{\alpha\gamma}g_{\beta\delta}+ic_6g_{\alpha\delta}g_{\beta\gamma}\Big)\delta^{ab}\delta^{cd}$$
$$\times\delta^4(y_1-y_2)\delta^4(y_3-y_4)\delta^4(y_1-y_3)+2\text{ perm.} \qquad (434)$$

$$\mathbf{F}_S(t)+\frac{1}{f_\pi} = \quad -\frac{1}{f_\pi^3}\Big(t-\frac{m_\pi^2}{2}\Big)\mathcal{J}(t)$$
$$+\frac{m_\pi^2}{f_\pi^3}(c_2+c_3-c_8)-\frac{1}{2f_\pi^3}c_7(t-2m_\pi^2) \qquad (435)$$

$$i\mathcal{T}_{\rm rest} = \quad +\frac{i}{f_\pi^4}m_\pi^2\delta^{ab}\delta^{cd}\Big(2t-\frac{5}{2}m_\pi^2\Big)\mathcal{J}(t)$$
$$+\frac{i}{4f_\pi^4}\Big(2\delta^{ab}\delta^{cd}+\delta^{ac}\delta^{bd}+\delta^{ab}\delta^{bc}\Big)(t-2m_\pi^2)^2\mathcal{J}(t)$$
$$+\frac{im_\pi^2}{f_\pi^4}\delta^{ab}\delta^{cd}\Big(m_\pi^2(c_8-c_2-c_3)+(t-2m_\pi^2)c_7\Big)$$
$$+\frac{ic_5}{2f_\pi^4}\delta^{ab}\delta^{cd}(t-2m_\pi^2)^2+\frac{ic_6}{4f_\pi^4}\delta^{ab}\delta^{cd}(s-2m_\pi^2)^2$$
$$+\frac{ic_6}{4f_\pi^4}\delta^{ab}\delta^{cd}(u-2m_\pi^2)^2+2\text{ perm}+\mathcal{O}\Big(\frac{1}{f_\pi^6}\Big). \qquad (436)$$

Similarly, equations (281, 283, 286) read

$$A_{\rm rest}(s,t,u) = \quad +\frac{1}{2f_\pi^4}(s^2-m_\pi^4)\mathcal{J}(s)$$
$$+\frac{1}{4f_\pi^4}(t-m_\pi^2)^2\mathcal{J}(t)+\frac{1}{4f_\pi^2}(u-2m_\pi^2)^2\mathcal{J}(u)$$
$$+\frac{m_\pi^2}{f_\pi^4}\Big(m_\pi^2(c_8-c_2-c_3)+(s-2m_\pi^2)c_7\Big)$$
$$+\frac{1}{2f_\pi^4}c_5(s-2m_\pi^2)^2+\frac{1}{4f_\pi^4}c_6(t-2m_\pi^2)^2+\frac{1}{4f_\pi^4}c_6(u-2m_\pi^2)^2$$
$$+\mathcal{O}\Big(\frac{1}{f_\pi^6}\Big) \qquad (437)$$

$$\mathbf{F}_V(q^2) = 1 + \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2}\Big((c_1 + c_4 - c_2 + \frac{1}{72\pi^2})q^2 + \frac{1}{3}(q^2 - 4m_\pi^2)\mathcal{J}(q^2)\Big) + \mathcal{O}\Big(\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}\Big) \tag{438}$$

$$\begin{aligned} C(s,t,u) = \quad & -\frac{1}{f_\pi^4}(s - 2m_\pi^2)^2(c_1 + c_4 - c_2 + \frac{1}{144\pi^2}) \\ & +\frac{1}{4f_\pi^4}(s^2 + (t-u)^2)(c_1 + c_4 - c_2 + \frac{1}{144\pi^2}) \\ & +\frac{m_\pi^2}{f_\pi^4}\Big(m_\pi^2(c_8 - c_2 - c_3) + (s - 2m_\pi^2)c_7\Big) \\ & +\frac{1}{2f_\pi^4}(c_5 + c_1)(s - 2m_\pi^2)^2 + \frac{1}{8f_\pi^4}(c_6 - c_1)(s^2 + (t-u)^2). \end{aligned} \tag{439}$$

At first sight (439) does not agree with Ref. [8] which gives

$$\begin{aligned} C(s,t,u) = \frac{1}{96\pi^2 F^4} \quad & \Big(+ 2(\bar{l}_1 - \frac{4}{3})(s - 2M^2)^2 \\ & +(\bar{l}_6 - \frac{5}{6})(s^2 + (t-u)^2) - 12M^2 s + 15M^4\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{440}$$

with only two parameters. However, this is because the tree term in Ref. [8] is taken as $(s - M^2)/F^2$ rather than (279). If we express M and F in terms of the physical values m_π and f_π, we pick up an extra contribution to $C(s,t,u)$

$$\frac{M^2}{8\pi^2 F^4}(s - M^2)\bar{l}_4 - \frac{M^4}{32\pi^2 F^4}\bar{l}_3 \tag{441}$$

so there are four parameters in total.

As a check, comparison of (435) with the corresponding expression in Ref. [8] gives

$$\begin{aligned} c_7 \quad & \leftrightarrow \frac{1}{8\pi^2}(\bar{l}_4 - 1) \\ c_2 + c_3 + c_7 - c_8 \quad & \leftrightarrow \frac{1}{32\pi^2}(\bar{l}_3 - 1) \end{aligned} \tag{442}$$

while (439-441) give

$$\begin{aligned} -(c_1 + c_4 - c_2 + \frac{1}{144\pi^2}) + \frac{1}{2}(c_5 + c_1) \quad & \leftrightarrow \frac{1}{48\pi^2}(\bar{l}_1 - \frac{4}{3}) \\ +\frac{1}{4}(c_1 + c_4 - c_2 + \frac{1}{144\pi^2}) + \frac{1}{8}(c_6 - c_1) \quad & \leftrightarrow \frac{1}{96\pi^2}(\bar{l}_2 - \frac{5}{6}) \\ +c_7 \quad & \leftrightarrow \frac{1}{8\pi^2}(\bar{l}_4 - 1) \\ +(c_8 - c_2 - c_3) \quad & \leftrightarrow \frac{1}{8\pi^2}\bar{l}_4 - \frac{1}{32\pi^2}(\bar{l}_3 + 3) \end{aligned} \tag{443}$$

which are seen to be consistent.

We therefore conclude that chiral symmetry does not yield any constraints on $\pi\pi$ scattering at one-loop level other than those already given by unitarity, causality and the tree term. It also follows that all six on-shell parameters can be extracted from the pion data *without* recourse to $SU(3)$ or other considerations. Specifically, equations (293, 297, 301) are modified to

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\mathrm{rho}}(s,t,u) = \quad & +\frac{1}{4f_\pi^4}(s-u)t\mathbf{\Pi}_V(t) + \frac{1}{4f_\pi^4}(s-t)u\mathbf{\Pi}_V(u) \\ & +\frac{1}{f_\pi^2 m_\rho^2}(s-u)t\Big(1-\frac{f_\rho^2}{2f_\pi^2}\Big) + \frac{1}{f_\pi^2 m_\rho^2}(s-t)u\Big(1-\frac{f_\rho^2}{2f_\pi^2}\Big) \qquad (444) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} a_0^0(\mathrm{rho}) &= 0 \\ b_0^0(\mathrm{rho}) &= +\frac{m_\pi^2}{4\pi f_\pi^4} - \frac{m_\pi^2}{\pi f_\pi^2 m_\rho^2} = -0.010\ m_\pi^{-2} \\ a_2^0(\mathrm{rho}) &= -\frac{1}{60\pi f_\pi^4}\frac{f_\rho^2}{m_\rho^2} + \frac{1}{15\pi f_\pi^2 m_\rho^2} + \frac{1}{7200\pi^3 f_\pi^4} = 6.5\ 10^{-4}\ m_\pi^{-4} \\ a_1^1(\mathrm{rho}) &= -\frac{m_\pi^2}{8\pi f_\pi^4}\frac{f_\rho^2}{m_\rho^2} + \frac{m_\pi^2}{2\pi f_\pi^2 m_\rho^2} + \frac{m_\pi^2}{864\pi^3 f_\pi^4} = +0.0049\ m_\pi^{-2} \\ a_0^2(\mathrm{rho}) &= 0 \\ b_0^2(\mathrm{rho}) &= -\frac{m_\pi^2}{8\pi f_\pi^4}\frac{f_\rho^2}{m_\rho^2} + \frac{m_\pi^2}{2\pi f_\pi^2 m_\rho^2} = +0.0047\ m_\pi^{-2} \\ a_2^2(\mathrm{rho}) &= +\frac{1}{120\pi f_\pi^4}\frac{f_\rho^2}{m_\rho^2} - \frac{1}{30\pi f_\pi^2 m_\rho^2} - \frac{1}{14400\pi^3 f_\pi^4} = -3.3\ 10^{-4}\ m_\pi^{-4} \qquad (445) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} a_0^0(\mathrm{rest}) &= \frac{m_\pi^4}{32\pi f_\pi^4}\Big(5(c_8-c_2-c_3)+2c_7+10c_6+10c_5+\frac{49}{16\pi^2}\Big) \\ b_0^0(\mathrm{rest}) &= \frac{m_\pi^2}{32\pi f_\pi^4}\Big(8c_7+24c_6+32c_5+\frac{91}{24\pi^2}\Big) \\ a_2^0(\mathrm{rest}) &= \frac{1}{240\pi f_\pi^4}\Big(8c_6+4c_5-\frac{73}{240\pi^2}\Big) \\ a_1^1(\mathrm{rest}) &= \frac{m_\pi^2}{96\pi f_\pi^4}\Big(4c_7+4c_6-8c_5-\frac{1}{16\pi^2}\Big) \\ a_0^2(\mathrm{rest}) &= \frac{m_\pi^4}{32\pi f_\pi^4}\Big(2(c_8-c_2-c_3)-4c_7+4c_6+4c_5+\frac{1}{4\pi^2}\Big) \\ b_0^2(\mathrm{rest}) &= \frac{m_\pi^2}{32\pi f_\pi^4}\Big(-4c_7+12c_6+8c_5+\frac{35}{48\pi^2}\Big) \\ a_2^2(\mathrm{rest}) &= \frac{1}{240\pi f_\pi^4}\Big(2c_6+4c_5-\frac{19}{240\pi^2}\Big). \qquad (446) \end{aligned}$$

These results are consistent with the data (292), but the error bars are rather large. For c_7,

$$\begin{aligned}16\pi^2 c_7 = \quad & +\frac{64\pi^3 f_\pi^4}{m_\pi^2}\Big(b_0^0(\text{exp}) - b_0^0(\text{tree}) - b_0^0(\text{rho})\Big) \\ & -640\pi^3 f_\pi^4\Big(a_2^0(\text{exp}) - a_2^0(\text{rho})\Big) \\ & -3200\pi^3 f_\pi^4\Big(a_2^2(\text{exp}) - a_2^2(\text{rho})\Big) - \frac{189}{20} = 9.0 \pm 13\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}16\pi^2 c_7 = \quad & +\frac{384\pi^3 f_\pi^4}{m_\pi^2}\Big(a_1^1(\text{exp}) - a_1^1(\text{tree}) - a_1^1(\text{rho})\Big) \\ & -1280\pi^3 f_\pi^4\Big(a_2^0(\text{exp}) - a_2^0(\text{rho})\Big) \\ & +3200\pi^3 f_\pi^4\Big(a_2^2(\text{exp}) - a_2^2(\text{rho})\Big) - \frac{19}{60} = 7.8 \pm 8\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}16\pi^2 c_7 = \quad & -\frac{128\pi^3 f_\pi^4}{m_\pi^2}\Big(b_0^2(\text{exp}) - b_0^2(\text{tree}) - b_0^2(\text{rho})\Big) \\ & +1280\pi^3 f_\pi^4\Big(a_2^0(\text{exp}) - a_2^0(\text{rho})\Big) \\ & +640\pi^3 f_\pi^4\Big(a_2^2(\text{exp}) - a_2^2(\text{rho})\Big) + \frac{19}{4} = 13.1 \pm 7\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}16\pi^2 c_7 = \quad & +\frac{128\pi^3 f_\pi^4}{3m_\pi^4}\Big(a_0^0(\text{exp}) - a_0^0(\text{tree})\Big) \\ & -\frac{320\pi^3 f_\pi^4}{3m_\pi^4}\Big(a_0^2(\text{exp}) - a_0^2(\text{tree})\Big) - \frac{13}{4} = 6.0 \pm 19\end{aligned} \tag{447}$$

For the remainder we have,

$$\begin{aligned}16\pi^2(c_6 - c_1) = 640\pi^3 f_\pi^4\Big(\quad & +a_2^0(\text{exp}) - a_2^0(\text{rho}) - a_2^2(\text{exp}) + a_2^2(\text{rho})\Big) \\ & +\frac{3}{5} - 16\pi^2\frac{f_\rho^2}{m_\rho^2} = -2.6 \pm 1.7\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}16\pi^2(c_5 + c_1) = 320\pi^3 f_\pi^4\Big(\quad & +4a_2^2(\text{exp}) - 4a_2^2(\text{rho}) - a_2^0(\text{exp}) + a_2^0(\text{rho})\Big) \\ & +\frac{1}{60} + 16\pi^2\frac{f_\rho^2}{m_\rho^2} = +7.1 \pm 2.5\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
16\pi^2(c_8 - c_2 - c_3) = \qquad & +\frac{512\pi^3 f_\pi^4}{5m_\pi^4}\Big(+ a_0^0(\exp) - a_0^0(\text{tree})\Big) \\
& -640\pi^3 f_\pi^4 \Big(a_2^0(\exp) - a_2^0(\text{rho})\Big) \\
& -1280\pi^3 f_\pi^4 \Big(a_2^2(\exp) - a_2^2(\text{rho})\Big) \\
& -\frac{32\pi^2}{5} c_7 - \frac{331}{30} = 41 \pm 32
\end{aligned}
\tag{448}
$$

where we have used the average value $c_7 = 0.057$ following from (447) for the last term in (448).

We note that the pion isoscalar charge radius $< r^2 >_S$ follows from

$$
\mathbf{F}_S(t) = \mathbf{F}_S(0)\Big(1 + \frac{t}{6} < r^2 >_S + \mathcal{O}(t^2)\Big). \tag{449}
$$

Taylor expanding (435) and using the average value $c_7 = 0.057$, we obtain the central value

$$
< r^2 >_S = \frac{3}{f_\pi^2}\Big(c_7 - \frac{1}{96\pi^2}\Big) \sim 0.75 \text{ fm}^2. \tag{450}
$$

in agreement with the value 0.7 ± 0.2 fm^2 as quoted in Ref. [8]. A better measurement of the $\pi\pi$ scattering lengths and range parameters are called for, to narrow the accuracy on the determination of c_7 and thus the pion scalar charge radius. The isovector charge radius of the pion is used as an input in (429).

Finally, we note that the one-loop correction to the radiative decay of the pion for the general case $\pi \to e\nu\gamma^*$ is no longer (205) but

$$
\begin{aligned}
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi}\epsilon^{abc}\Big(g_{\mu\nu}(k^2 - m_\pi^2) - k_\mu k_\nu\Big) \\
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi}\epsilon^{abc} c_2 (2p_\mu - q_\mu) k_\nu \frac{m_\pi^2}{k^2 - m_\pi^2} \\
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi}\epsilon^{abc} c_2 (2p_\mu - q_\mu) p_\beta \Big(g_\nu^\beta - \frac{k_\nu k^\beta}{k^2 - m_\pi^2}\Big) \\
& -\frac{1}{f_\pi}\epsilon^{abc} c_4 p_\mu q_\beta \Big(g_\nu^\beta - \frac{k_\nu k^\beta}{k^2 - m_\pi^2}\Big) \\
& +\frac{1}{f_\pi}\epsilon^{abc} c_4 p\cdot q \Big(g_{\mu\nu} - \frac{k_\mu k_\nu}{k^2 - m_\pi^2}\Big) \\
& -\frac{i}{f_\pi}\epsilon^{abc}\Big(g_\nu^\beta - \frac{k_\nu k^\beta}{k^2 - m_\pi^2}\Big)\Big(- g_{\mu\beta} q^2 + q_\mu q_\beta\Big)\ \Pi_V(q^2)
\end{aligned}
\tag{451}
$$

For on-shell photons $q^2 = 0$, the last term drops. The one-loop correction depends on the two parameters c_2 and c_4.

Appendix F : One-Loop Integrals

In this appendix we summarise some one-loop integrals needed in some of the calculations discussed in section 18.

- $\mathcal{J}(s)$

$$\mathcal{J}(s = q^2) = -i \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} \Big(\frac{1}{k^2 - m_\pi^2 + i0} \frac{1}{(k-q)^2 - m_\pi^2 + i0} - (q = 0) \Big) \tag{452}$$

After Feynman parametrization we have

$$16\pi^2 \mathcal{J}(s = q^2) = \int_0^1 dx \frac{x(1-2x)q^2}{x(1-x)q^2 - m_\pi^2 + i0} \tag{453}$$

- $\mathcal{J}_{\mu\nu}(q,p)$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{\mu\nu}(q,p) = i \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} \Big(\quad & \frac{1}{k^2 - m_\pi^2 + i0} \frac{1}{(k+q)^2 - m_\pi^2 + i0} \frac{1}{(k+p)^2 - m_\pi^2 + i0} \\ & \times (2k_\mu + q_\mu)(2k_\nu + p_\nu) + \text{counterterms} \Big) \end{aligned} \tag{454}$$

After Feynman parametrisation we have

$$\begin{aligned} 16\pi^2 \mathcal{J}_{\mu\nu}(q,p) = \quad & +2g_{\mu\nu} \int_0^1 dx \int_0^{1-x} dy \, \ln\Big(\Big(m_\pi^2 + (xq + yp)^2 - xq^2 - yp^2 - i0 \Big) / m_\pi^2 \Big) \\ & + \int_0^1 dx \int_0^{1-x} dy \Big((1-2x)q_\mu - 2yp_\mu \Big) \Big((1-2y)p_\nu - 2xq_\nu \Big) \\ & \times \Big(m_\pi^2 + (xq + yp)^2 - xq^2 - yp^2 - i0 \Big)^{-1} \end{aligned} \tag{455}$$

- $\mathcal{J}_{\mu\nu\rho}(q,p)$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{\mu\nu\rho}(q,p) = i \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} \Big(\quad & \frac{1}{k^2 - m_\pi^2 + i0} \frac{1}{(k+q)^2 - m_\pi^2 + i0} \frac{1}{(k+p)^2 - m_\pi^2 + i0} \\ & \times (2k_\mu + q_\mu)(2k_\nu + p_\nu)(2k_\rho + (q-p)_\rho) - (q = p = 0) \Big) \end{aligned} \tag{456}$$

After Feynman parametrization we have

$$\begin{aligned}
16\pi^2\mathcal{J}_{\mu\nu\rho}(q,p) = \quad & -2i\int_0^1 dx\int_0^{1-x} dy\Big[g_{\mu\nu}\Big((1-2x)q_\rho+(1-2y)p_\rho\Big) \\
& +g_{\nu\rho}\Big((1-2x)q_\mu-2yp_\mu\Big)+g_{\rho\mu}\Big((1-2y)p_\nu-2xq_\nu\Big)\Big] \\
& \times\ln\Big(\Big(m_\pi^2+(xq+yp)^2-xq^2-yp^2-i0\Big)/m_\pi^2\Big) \\
& -i\int_0^1 dx\int_0^{1-x} dy\Big((1-2x)q_\mu-2yp_\mu\Big) \\
& \times\Big((1-2y)p_\nu-2xq_\nu\Big)\Big((1-2x)q_\rho+(1-2x)p_\rho\Big) \\
& \times\Big(m_\pi^2+(xq+yp)^2-xq^2-yp^2-i0\Big)^{-1} \qquad (457)
\end{aligned}$$

The Feynman integrals appearing in the above can be undone by noting that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{I}_1(s) = \quad & \int_0^1 dx\frac{x(1-2x)s}{x(1-x)s-m_\pi^2+i0} \\
= \quad & 2+\Big(1-\frac{4m_\pi^2}{s}\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\ln\Big(\frac{\sqrt{s-4m_\pi^2}-\sqrt{s}}{\sqrt{s-4m_\pi^2}+\sqrt{s}}\Big)+i\pi\Big) \qquad (458)
\end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{I}_2(s) = \quad & \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{x}\ \ln\Big(1-\frac{s}{m_\pi^2}x(1-x)\Big) \\
= \quad & \int_0^{\frac{1}{x_+}} \frac{dx}{x}\ \ln\Big(1-x\Big)+\int_0^{\frac{1}{x_-}} \frac{dx}{x}\ \ln\Big(1-x\Big) \qquad (459)
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$2x_\pm = 1\pm\sqrt{1-\frac{4m_\pi^2}{s}} \qquad (460)$$

Since

$$\int_0^z \frac{dx}{x}\ \ln\Big(1-x\Big)+\int_0^{\frac{z}{z-1}} \frac{dx}{x}\ \ln\Big(1-x\Big) = \frac{1}{2}\ \ln^2\Big(1-z\Big) \qquad (461)$$

and choosing the branch cut of the logarithm along the Re$s\geq 0$ axis, we have

$$\mathbf{I}_2(s) = \frac{1}{2}\Big(\ln\Big(\frac{\sqrt{s-4m_\pi^2}-\sqrt{s}}{\sqrt{s-4m_\pi^2}+\sqrt{s}}\Big)+i\pi\Big)^2 \qquad (462)$$

With the above in mind, we have

$$16\pi^2\mathcal{J}(s) = 2+\Big(1-\frac{4m_\pi^2}{s}\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\ln\Big(\frac{x_-}{x_+}\Big)+i\pi\Big) \qquad (463)$$

$$\begin{aligned}16\pi^2\mathcal{K}(s) = &\quad \int_0^1 dx \int_0^{1-x} dy \, \ln\Big(1 - \frac{s}{m_\pi^2} xy - i0\Big) \\ = &\quad -\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\Big(1 - \frac{4m_\pi^2}{s}\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\ln\Big(\frac{x_-}{x_+}\Big) + i\pi\Big) - \frac{m_\pi^2}{2s}\Big(\ln\Big(\frac{x_-}{x_+}\Big) + i\pi\Big)^2\end{aligned} \tag{464}$$

$$\begin{aligned}16\pi^2\mathcal{H}(s) = &\quad \int_0^1 dx \int_0^{1-x} dy \, (1-2x) \ln\Big(1 - \frac{s}{m_\pi^2} xy - i0\Big) \\ = &\quad -\Big(\frac{11}{18} + \frac{8m_\pi^2}{3s}\Big) \\ &\quad +\Big(\frac{1}{3}\Big(1 - \frac{4m_\pi^2}{s}\Big)^{3/2} - \frac{1}{2}\Big(1 - \frac{4m_\pi^2}{s}\Big)\Big)\Big(\ln\Big(\frac{x_-}{x_+}\Big) + i\pi\Big) \\ &\quad -\frac{m_\pi^2}{2s}\Big(\ln\Big(\frac{x_-}{x_+}\Big) + i\pi\Big)^2\end{aligned} \tag{465}$$

Appendix G : Unresolved Issues in Chiral Perturbation Theory

In this Appendix, we wish to call upon some unresolved technical issues as they appear in the general context of chiral perturbation theory as discussed by Gasser and Leutwyler [8, 75]. The first issue is related to the use of the pion equations of motion in the nonlinear sigma model

$$\Big(-\nabla^\mu\nabla_\mu + \underline{a}^\mu \cdot \underline{a}_\mu - m_\pi^2 - s\Big)\pi + J = \mathcal{O}\Big(\frac{\pi^2}{f_\pi}\Big). \tag{466}$$

In the path-integral approach of Ref. [8], the equation must be solved with Steuckelberg-Feynman boundary conditions, giving

$$\pi = -G_F\, J + \mathcal{O}\Big(\frac{\pi^2}{f_\pi}\Big). \tag{467}$$

The result corresponds to equation (10.21) in Ref. [8]. Explicitly

$$U_1^i = (\Box + M^2)^{-1}\Big(\partial^\mu a_\mu^i + \chi^i\Big). \tag{468}$$

Since G_F is complex, π is also complex. This is expected. Indeed, as emphasized by Faddeev [74], it is in general unjustified to assume that the fields in the path integral are real. This circumstance does not cause any problems for ordinary scalar theories. However, for the nonlinear sigma model, a complex π means that the chiral field $\overline{U}$ evaluated at the stationary point is non-unitary, that is $\overline{U}\,\overline{U}^\dagger \neq \mathbf{1}$, which leads to several difficulties [39]. The first one is that we will obtain different answers according to whether we write the original Lagrangian as

$$+\frac{f_\pi^2}{4}\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\partial^\mu U\,\partial_\mu U^\dagger\Big)\ ,\qquad +\frac{f_\pi^2}{4}\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\partial^\mu U\,\partial_\mu U^{-1}\Big)\ ,\qquad -\frac{f_\pi^2}{4}\mathrm{Tr}\Big(U^\dagger\partial^\mu U\,U^\dagger\partial_\mu U\Big).$$

The second one is that the integration measure $d\mu(U)$ must be redefined. A third one is that there is an infinite number of terms such as $\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\overline{U}\,\overline{U}^\dagger\Big)^n$ which are invariant under $SU(2)\times SU(2)$ and may be added to the Lagrangian.

All such difficulties disappear if we work in Euclidean space. However, the problem still remain as to whether we should continue $U^\dagger$ or U^{-1} or something else (e.g. Green's functions) when coming to Minkowski space.

The second issue arises when multi-loop effects are considered. In his general analysis of the foundations of chiral perturbation theory, Leutwyler makes use of stationary points of higher derivative actions [75]. However, it is known that higher derivative actions generally give rise to pathological effects that are at odd with positivity and causality, thereby jeoperdizing the main conclusions beyond one loop. The recent two-loop calculation by Belluci, Gasser and Sainio [49] avoids this problem by using the stationary point of the minimal derivative action. The minimal stationary point is pathological free and allows for simple chiral counting. We do not know whether this analysis could be used to revise Leutwyler's general analysis. The latter is important for the overall consistency of chiral perturbation theory beyond one loop.

Overall, we believe that a resolution of the concerns we have raised is desirable for further comparison between Ref. [8] and our approach.

Appendix H : Elements for a Two-Loop Calculation

In this Appendix, we will outline the necessary elements for extending our one-loop analysis of section 18 to two loops. To lowest order (103) reads as

$$\Big[\pi_{\rm in}, \hat{\mathcal{S}}_0\Big] = \hat{\mathcal{S}}_0\tilde{G}\mathbf{K}\pi_{\rm in} - \tilde{G}\,J\,\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0 \tag{469}$$

where $\tilde{G}$ is given in (376). We now write

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}} = \hat{\mathcal{S}}_0\Big(1 + \frac{i}{f_\pi}\Theta_1 - \frac{1}{f_\pi^2}\Theta_2\Big)$$

where unitarity requires

$$\Theta_1^\dagger = \Theta_1 \qquad\qquad \Theta_2 + \Theta_2^\dagger = \Theta_1^2. \tag{470}$$

Substitution into (103) gives

$$\Big[\Big(1 + \tilde{G}\mathbf{K}\Big)\pi_{\rm in}, \Theta_1\Big] = -\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0^\dagger \tilde{G}\nabla^\mu a_\mu \frac{\delta\hat{S}_0}{\delta s} + \hat{\mathcal{S}}_0^\dagger \tilde{G}\mathbf{X}_A\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0 \tag{471}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Big[\Big(1 + \tilde{G}\mathbf{K}\Big)\pi_{\rm in}, \Theta_2\Big] = \quad & -i\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0^\dagger \tilde{G}\, J - \hat{\mathcal{S}}_0^\dagger \tilde{G}\nabla^\mu a_\mu \frac{\delta\hat{S}_0}{\delta s}\Theta_1 \\ & -\tilde{G}\nabla^\mu a_\mu \frac{\delta\Theta_1}{\delta s} + \hat{\mathcal{S}}_0^\dagger \tilde{G}(\mathbf{X}_A\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0)\Theta_1 + \tilde{G}\mathbf{X}_A\Theta_1.\end{aligned} \tag{472}$$

Multiplying by

$$\Big(1 + \tilde{G}\mathbf{K}\Big)^{-1} = 1 - \Delta\mathbf{K}\Big(1 + G_A\mathbf{K}\Big)$$

yields

$$\Big[\pi_{\rm in}, \Theta_1\Big] = -\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0^\dagger \Delta\Big(1 + \mathbf{K}G_A\Big)\nabla^\mu a_\mu \frac{\delta\hat{S}_0}{\delta s} + \hat{\mathcal{S}}_0^\dagger \Delta\Big(1 + \mathbf{K}G_A\Big)\mathbf{X}_A\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0 \tag{473}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Big[\pi_{\rm in}, \Theta_2 - \Theta_2^\dagger\Big] = \quad & \Big[\Big[\pi_{\rm in}, \Theta_1\Big], \Theta_1\Big] - 2i\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0^\dagger \Delta\Big(1 + \mathbf{K}G_A\Big)J\frac{\delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0}{\delta s} \\ & -\Delta\Big(1 + \mathbf{K}G_A\Big)\nabla^\mu a_\mu \frac{\delta\Theta_1}{\delta s} + \Delta\Big(1 + \mathbf{K}G_A\Big)\mathbf{X}_A\Theta_1.\end{aligned} \tag{474}$$

Equations (469-474) completely fix the pionic part of Θ_1 and Θ_2 up to c-numbers. Furthermore, (379) to lowest order

$$\Big[\pi_{\rm out}, \hat{\mathcal{S}}_0^\dagger \delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0\Big] = \tilde{G}(\delta\mathbf{K})\pi - \tilde{G}\delta J \tag{475}$$

implies that $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0^\dagger \delta\hat{\mathcal{S}}_0$ is at most quadratic in $\pi_{\rm in}$, so that Θ_1 is at most cubic in $\pi_{\rm in}$, and $\Theta_2 - \Theta_2^\dagger$ is quintic in $\pi_{\rm in}$. These relations are sufficient to extend the present analysis to two loops. This construction will be discussed elsewhere.

Figure Captions

Figure 1 : Threshold contribution to $\gamma N \to \pi N$ without baryon dynamics. (a) is the pion t-channel pole and (b) the Kroll-Ruderman term.

Figure 2 : Contributions to $\gamma N \to \gamma\pi N$ at threshold, to leading order in the electromagnetic charge.

Figure 3 : Contributions to $\gamma N \to \pi\pi N$ at threshold, to leading order in the electromagnetic charge. The solid line (V) refers to the isovector vector-current $\mathbf{V}$.

Figure 4 : Contributions to $\pi N \to \pi\gamma N$ at threshold, to leading order in the electromagnetic charge. The solid line (V) refers to the isovector vector-current $\mathbf{V}$.

Figure 5 : (a) Three-loop contribution to the four-point function $< 0|T^*(\mathbf{j}_A\mathbf{j}_A\mathbf{j}_A\mathbf{j}_A)|0 >$, where $\mathbf{j}_A$ is one-pion reduced. (b) Related divergences from the subdiagrams.

Figure 6 : Divergent $v\hat{s}$-graphs (a,b,c), $\hat{s}$-tadpole (d), and $\hat{s}\hat{s}$-graph (e). The divergences are at the origin of the unspecified parameters in the effective action at one-loop.

Figure 7 : Typical contributions to the vacuum correlators in the process $\gamma\gamma \to \pi\pi$ as given by (304). The solid V-lines refer to the isovector vector-current $\mathbf{V}$, the solid A-lines refers to the one-pion reduced isovector axial-current $\mathbf{j}_A$, and the solid S-line refers to the scalar current triggered by $\hat{\sigma}$.

References

[1] Y. Nambu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **4** (1960) 380 ; Y. Nambu and D. Lurie, Phys. Rev. **125** (1962) 1429; Y. Nambu and E. Shrauner, Phys. Rev. **128** (1962) 862.

[2] S. Fubini and G. Furlan, Ann. Phys. **48** (1968) 1322; V. De Alfaro, S. Fubini, G. Furlan and C. Rossetti, " Currents in Hadron Physics ", North-Holland 1973.

[3] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **17** (1966) 616; **18** (1967) 188, 507 ; S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **166** (1968) 1568.

[4] S. Coleman, J. Wess, and B. Zumino, Phys. Rev. **177** (1969) 2239 ; C. Callan, S. Coleman, J. Wess, and B. Zumino, Phys. Rev. **177** (1969) 2247.

[5] S. Weinberg, Physica **A96** (1979) 327.

[6] R. Dashen, Phys. Rev. **133** (1969) 1245; R. Dashen and M. Weinstein, Phys. Rev. **133** (1969) 1291.

[7] L.F. Li and H. Pagels, Phys. Rev. Lett. **26** (1971) 1204; H. Pagels, Phys. Rep. **C16** (1975) 219.

[8] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Ann. Phys. **158** (1984) 142.

[9] M. Veltman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **17** (1966) 553; J.S. Bell, Nuovo Cim. (Ser. X) **50A** (1967) 129.

[10] H. Leutwyler, " Chiral Effective Lagrangians ", BUTP-91-26; A.V. Manohar, " Chiral Perturbation Theory ", UCSD-PTH-93-12; E. de Rafael, " Chiral Perturbation Theory ", CPT-93-P2967; G. Ecker, "Chiral Perturbation Theory", UWThPh-94-49; J. Bijnens, " Chiral Perturbation Theory ", NORDITA-95-12; V. Bernard, N. Kaiser and U.G. Meissner, " Chiral Dynamics in Nucleons and Nuclei ", CRN-95-3.

[11] R.E. Peierls, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) **A214** (1952) 143.

[12] E. Witten, Phys. Lett. **B117** (1982) 324.

[13] N.N. Bogoliubov and D.V. Shirkov, " Introduction to the Theory of Quantized Fields ", John-Wiley, N.Y. 1980.

[14] H. Yamagishi, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A4** (1989) 2591.

[15] K. Nishijima, Nuovo Cim. (Ser. X) **11** (1959) 698; F. Gursey, Nuovo Cim. (Ser. X) **16** (1960) 230.

[16] I. Watanabe, Prog. Theor. Phys. **10** (1953) 371.

[17] Y. Tomozawa, Nuovo Cim. (Ser. X) **46A** (1966) 707; See also, K. Raman and E.C. Sudarshan, Phys. Lett. **21** (1966) 450; Balachandran, Gundzik and Nicodemi, unpublished.

[18] M.L. Goldberger, H. Miyazawa and R. Oehme, Phys. Rev. **99** (1955) 986.

[19] S. Adler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **14** (1965) 1051; Phys. Rev. **140** (1965) B736; W. Weisberger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **14** (1965) 1047; Phys. Rev. **143** (1966) 1302.

[20] N.M. Kroll and M.A. Ruderman, Phys. Rev. **93** (1954) 233.

[21] E. Mazucatto *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57** (1986) 3144.

[22] R. Beck *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65** (1990) 1841.

[23] T. Welch *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69** (1992) 2761.

[24] V. Bernard, N. Kaiser and U.G. Meissner, CRN-94-62, TK-94-18.

[25] H. Yamagishi and I. Zahed, work in progress.

[26] L.N. Chang, Phys. Rev. **162** (1967) 1497.

[27] J. Beringer, πN Newsletter **7** (1993) 33.

[28] V. Bernard, N. Kaiser and U.G. Meissner, Phys. Lett. **B332** (1994) 415.

[29] G. Grayer *et al.* , Nucl. Phys. **B75** (1974) 189.

[30] A. de Lesquen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D39** (1989) 21.

[31] M. Svec, Phys. Rev. **D46** (1992) 949.

[32] D. Pocanic *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72** (1994) 1156; H. Burkhardt and J. Lowe, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67** (1991) 2622; M.E. Sevior *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66** (1991) 2569;

[33] T.A. Aibergenov *et al.*, Czech. J. Phys. **B36** (1986) 948.

[34] P.W. Carruthers and H.W. Huang, Phys. Lett. **B24** (1967) 464.

[35] J.M. Laget, Phys Rep. **69** (1981) 1.

[36] R. Dahm and D. Dreschsel, in Proc. Seventh-Amsterdam Mini-Conference, Eds. H.P. Blok, J.H. Koch and H. De Vries, Amsterdam (1991).

[37] V. Bernard, N. Kaiser and U.G. Meissner, in " Chiral Dynamics in Nucleons and Nuclei", CRN95-3, TK-95-1.

[38] Y.M. Antipov *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B121** (1983) 445; Z. Phys. **C24** (1984) 39.

[39] H. Yamagishi and I. Zahed, SUNY-Report 1988, unpublished.

[40] G. Ecker, J. Gasser, H. Leutwyler, A. Pich and E. de Rafael, Phys. Lett. **B223** (1989) 425.

[41] T.N. Truong, Phys. Rev. Lett. **22** (1988) 2526; T.N. Truong, Nucl. Phys. **B** (Proc. Suppl.) **24A** (1991) 93; A. Dobado, M.J. Herrero and T.N. Truong, Phys. Lett. **B235** (1990) 134.

[42] D.A. Bryman, P. Depommier and C. Leroy, Phys. Rep. **88** (1982) 151.

[43] J. Bijnens and F. Cornet, Nucl. Phys. **B296** (1988) 557; J.F. Donoghue, B.R. Holstein and Y.C. Lin, Phys. Rev. **D37** (1988) 2423.

[44] P. Ko, Phys. Rev. **D41** (1990) 1531.

[45] D. Morgand and M.R. Pennington, Phys. Lett. **B272** (1991) 134; T.N. Truong, Phys. Lett. **B313** (1993) 221; J.F. Donoghue and B.R. Holstein, Phys. Rev. **D48** (1993) 137.

[46] J. Boyer *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D42** (1990) 1350.

[47] H. Marsiske *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D41** 3324.

[48] M.V. Terentev, Sov. Phys. Usp. **17** (1974) 20; M.K. Volkov and V.N. Pervushin, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **22** (1976) 179.

[49] S. Belluci, J. Gasser and M.E. Sainio, Nucl. Phys. **B423** (1994) 80.

[50] B.R. Holstein, Comm. Nucl. Part. Phys. **19** (1990) 239, and references therein.

[51] J.F. Donoghue, B.R. Holstein and Y.C. Lin, Phys. Rev. **D37** (1988) 2423; D. Babusci *et al*, Phys. Lett. **B277** (1992) 158.

[52] J.F. Donoghue and B.R. Holstein, Phys. Rev. **D48** (1993) 137.

[53] V.A. Novikov, M.A. Shifman, A.I. Vainshtein, and V.I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. **B191** (1981) 301.

[54] P. Langacker and H. Pagels, Phys. Rev. **D8** (1973) 4595.

[55] M.D. Scadron and H.F. Jones, Phys. Rev. **D10** (1974) 967; H. Sazdjian and J. Stern, Nucl. Phys. **94** (1975) 163. See also, R.J. Crewther, Phys. Lett. **B176** (1986) 172.

[56] K. Kawarabayashi and M. Suzuki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **16** (1966) 255; Riazzuddin and Fayyazuddin, Phys. Rev. **147** (1966) 1071.

[57] T. Das, V.S. Mathur, and S. Okubo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **18** (1967) 761; **19** (1967) 859.

[58] C.A. Dominguez and J. Sola, Phys. Lett. **208** (1988) 131.

[59] S. Egli *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **175** (1986) 97.

[60] F. Scheck and A. Wullschleger, Nucl. Phys. **B67** (1973) 504; O.Y. Bardin *et al.*, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **14** (1972) 239.

[61] A.V. Manohar and H. Georgi, Nucl. Phys. **B234** (1984) 189.

[62] J.L. Petersen, Phys. Rep. **C2** (1971) 155.

[63] J. Steele, H. Yamagishi and I. Zahed, work in progress.

[64] L. Rosselet *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D15** (1977) 574.

[65] M. Baillargeon and P.J. Franzini, preprint PSI-PR-94-25.

[66] D. Babusci *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B227** (1992) 158.

[67] A.E. Kaloshin and V.V. Serebryakov, Phys. Lett **B278** (1992) 198.

[68] T.A. Aibergenov *et al.*, Czech. J. Phys. **B36** (1986) 948.

[69] Y.M. Antipov *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B121** (1983) 445.

[70] J. Stern, H. Sazdjian and N.H. Fuchs, Phys. Rev. **D47** (1993) 3814.

[71] B.S. DeWitt, in " Relativity, Groups and Topology " , Les Houches Lectures **XL**, Eds. B.S. DeWitt and R. Stora, North-Holland (1986).

[72] H. Sugawara, Phys. Rev. **170** (1968) 1659.

[73] D.Z. Freedman and P.K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. **B177** (1981) 282.

[74] L.D. Faddeev, in " Methods in Field Theory ", Les Houches Lectures, Eds. R. Balian and J. Zinn-Justin, North-Holland (1976).

[75] H. Leutwyler, Ann. Phys. **235** (1994) 165.

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9503413v1

This figure "fig2-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9503413v1

This figure "fig3-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9503413v1

This figure "fig1-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9503413v1

This figure "fig2-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9503413v1

This figure "fig1-3.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9503413v1

This figure "fig2-3.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9503413v1